

CA 30N4W058
75539

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
FEB 13 1982

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

THE SOCIAL PLANNING

and Research Council of Hamilton & District

Single Young People on Welfare

Prepared By

Robert Arnold
Research Associate

SINGLE YOUNG PEOPLE ON WELFARE

Prepared By

Robert Arnold
Research Associate

Social Planning and Research Council
of Hamilton & District

April, 1975

Hamilton, Ontario.

Price: \$7.50



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Hamilton Public Library

<https://archive.org/details/singleyoungpeopl00unse>

SOCIAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH COUNCIL OF HAMILTON & DISTRICT

RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

1972 - 1975

Dr. Nancy Beattie **	Dr. Ewan Macintyre
Dr. John Betak ***	Mr. Paul Mansfield *
Mrs. Mary Blum +	Dr. Stuart Mestelman
Mr. Robert Calder ++	Prof. Georges Potvin **
Mr. George Hill ***	Dr. Barbara Rosenblum ++
Dr. Roy Hornosty *	Dr. Norman Shulman
Mr. Peter Johnson ++	Dr. Paul Swingle *
Prof. Dennis Lyons ++	Mr. Sheldon Zelitt ++

STAFF

Robert Arnold, Research Associate

Shurl Kocman, Secretary

* resigned during 1972
** resigned during 1973
***resigned during 1974

+ appointed during 1973
++appointed during 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>PREFACE</u>	(v)
<u>CHAPTER 1</u> - <u>WHAT WE HOPED TO LEARN</u>	1-1
Focus of the Study	1-1
Reasons for a Study.	1-2
Why a Study of This Kind	1-3
Previous Studies	1-4
More Specific Topics of Study	1-7
<u>CHAPTER 2</u> - <u>HOW THE STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT</u>	2-1
Selecting the Sample	2-1
Interviewing	2-4
The Questionnaires	2-6
Data Quality	2-8
- The Questionnaire	2-8
- Interviewer Effects	2-8
- Consistency Over Time	2-9
Sample Bias	2-10
Sampling Error	2-11
<u>CHAPTER 3</u> - <u>ILLUSTRATIVE CASES</u>	3-1
Case No. 1 - A Young Man Who Lived For The Moment.	3-4
Case No. 2 - A Young Woman Who Hated Being On Welfare	3-7
Case No. 3 - A Young Man Who Found Work Quickly .	3-10
Case No. 4 - A Young Man Who Wanted A Stabler Existence	3-12
Case No. 5 - A Young Man With Foreign Training . .	3-15
Case No. 6 - A Young Woman Who Got Further Training	3-17
Case No. 7 - A Disillusioned Young Man	3-19
Case No. 8 - A Young Man Who Was Basically Satisfied With His Situation	3-21
Case No. 9 - A Young Man With Physical Limitations	3-23

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER 4</u> - <u>BACKGROUNDS, WAYS OF LIVING, VIEWS OF LIFE</u>	4-1
Personal Background	4-1
- General Characteristics	4-1
- Mobility	4-3
- Socio-economic Status	4-6
- Places of Residence	4-14
- Previous Employment	4-17
The Current Situation	4-23
- Feelings About Being on Welfare	4-23
- Attitudes of Parents and Friends	4-29
- Life Satisfaction	4-32
- Social Contacts	4-35
- A Counter-culture?	4-37
Drug Use	4-39
Marriage	4-43
Views of the Future	4-46
- Planning Ahead	4-48
- The Next Six Months	4-51
- Hopes For The Future	4-52
Looking For Work	4-55
- Job Seeking Effort	4-56
- Type of Firms Contacted	4-61
- Acceptable and Unacceptable Jobs	4-63
Summary of Findings	4-66
- Some Generalizations	4-66
- Some Common Responses	4-67
- Comparisons Among Groups	4-69
<u>CHAPTER 5</u> - <u>LEVELS OF JOB SEEKING</u>	5-1
Correlations With Job Seeking	5-2
- Personal Background	5-3
- Employment History and Employment Goals . .	5-10
- Styles of Life	5-12
- Personality Characteristics	5-18
- Hopes For The Future	5-22
- Summary	5-25

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 5 - Levels of Job Seeking cont'd	
Indexes To Predict Job Seeking	5-26
- Results of Regression for January Cases . .	5-27
- Results of Regression for the Longer-term Cases	5-29
Patterns Of Answers	5-31
- The Method of Classification	5-33
- Job Seeking Categories for the Short-term Cases	5-37
- Job Seeking Categories for the Longer-Term Cases	5-46
 <u>CHAPTER 6</u> - <u>FINDING WORK</u>	 6-1
Correlations With Job Finding	6-1
- Personal Background	6-2
- Employment History	6-5
- Personality Characteristics	6-8
- Plans for the Future	6-9
- Job Seeking	6-10
- Summary of Correlations	6-13
Predicting Job Finding	6-14
- Accuracy of Prediction	6-17
 <u>CHAPTER 7</u> - <u>SOME POLICY RELATED QUESTIONS</u>	 7-1
Why Are People On Welfare?	7-1
What Is It Like On Welfare?	7-5
Are People Making Reasonable Efforts To Find Work?	7-6
What Needs To Be Done To Get People Into Appropriate Jobs Faster?	7-9
 <u>APPENDIX A</u> - <u>METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX</u>	 A-1
Sampling	A-1
Statistical Problems Resulting From Population And Sample Sizes	A-3
Interviewer Effects	A-4
Sample Bias - Convictions in Magistrate's Court . .	A-6

	<u>Page</u>
<u>APPENDIX B</u> - <u>FIRST ROUND QUESTIONNAIRE</u>	B-1
<u>APPENDIX C</u> - <u>SECOND ROUND LONGER QUESTIONNAIRE</u>	C-1
<u>APPENDIX D</u> - <u>SECOND ROUND SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE</u>	D-1

	<u>Page</u>
<u>APPENDIX B</u> - <u>FIRST ROUND QUESTIONNAIRE</u>	B-1
<u>APPENDIX C</u> - <u>SECOND ROUND LONGER QUESTIONNAIRE</u>	C-1
<u>APPENDIX D</u> - <u>SECOND ROUND SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE</u>	D-1

PREFACE

This report differs from most social science reports in one major respect: an effort has been made to write as much of it as possible at a level understandable to people with less than a complete high school education. This has been done for three reasons. First, the Social Planning and Research Council has as one of its aims the development of citizen participation in consideration of social issues. This can only be hindered if its own reports are inaccessible to many people. Second, experience has shown that the single largest group of readers for our research reports has been high school students. Third, it was felt that members of a group which has been studied have a right to be able to understand, as far as possible, what has been said about them. The average level of schooling among our respondents was about Grade 10.

While an effort has been made to achieve a clear, non-technical style, the content of the report is basically the same as it would have been if we were writing for a professional audience. The necessary technical material, has, where possible, been placed in footnotes, or in the methodological appendix, or has been briefly explained.

The members of the Council's Research Advisory Committee are listed at the beginning of the report. I would like to express my appreciation for the Committee's assistance on decisions that had to be made on the course the study would take, and for the comments they have provided on drafts of the various chapters.

On the Council's behalf, as well as my own, I would like to express thanks to the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, and to two local foundations, which prefer to remain anonymous, for their contributions to the study.

I would also like to thank those who worked with me on the study - Linda-Mary Giles, my research assistant, and the interviewers, Ellis Bateson, Gail Civitarese, Mark Ewer, Bill Pasaratz and Brian Smale. Last, but not least, I would like to thank my secretary, Shurl Kocman, for her many hours of unpaid overtime, and her patience in preparing the several revisions of the report.

Robert Arnold,
Hamilton, Ontario,
April, 1975.

CHAPTER 1 - WHAT WE HOPED TO LEARN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Focus Of The Study	1-1
Reasons For A Study	1-2
Why A Study Of This Kind?	1-3
Previous Studies	1-4
More Specific Topics of Study	1-7

CHAPTER 1

WHAT WE HOPED TO LEARN

This chapter outlines the goals of the study. It begins with a brief statement of the focus of the study, explains why the study was done, and concludes with an overview of the questions we hoped to answer.

FOCUS OF THE STUDY

The study deals with single people, between 16 and 25 years of age, who were receiving welfare from the City of Hamilton* in early 1972. Our interest was focussed on four major topics:

- 1) their backgrounds and views of life;
- 2) their job seeking efforts;
- 3) their success or failure in finding work;
- 4) changes in their job seeking methods or their views of life over the period of the study.

We gathered our data through interviews in the first four months of 1972. We talked to ninety people who came on welfare in January, 1972, and who, when they applied, had no immediate prospects for getting off.** We also spoke with one hundred twenty-two who, on January 31, had been on the rolls for three months or more. No one going to school was contacted, since people in school would not (at least, ordinarily) be interested in full time work.

* More precisely, they were receiving assistance for shelter and general living expenses under the General Welfare Assistance Act.

**People with an immediate prospect for getting off would include those who, for example, were just passing through town, or who were waiting for their first Unemployment Insurance cheques to arrive. People in these and similar situations were not interviewed.

Where possible, a second interview was held five to eight weeks after the first, to ask about changes that might have taken place and to gather further data. Two-thirds of our respondents were contacted a second time.

REASONS FOR A STUDY

The study was done for three reasons.

First, the Board of the Social Planning and Research Council wanted to do whatever it could about unemployment. One possibility was to study the effects of unemployment or the work potential of the unemployed; hopefully, the findings would have a bearing on public policy.

Second, little Canadian research had been done on welfare recipients. Even such basic questions as their social backgrounds had scarcely been touched on. No studies, to our knowledge, had been focussed on why some recipients find jobs while others do not.* Yet this question needed to be answered; the answers might suggest ways of changing our welfare programs to get people into productive work faster.

Third, the growing numbers of young people on welfare had aroused a good deal of public discussion. The Government of Ontario had set up a Task Force to look into the situation of single, employable people on welfare. Many of these people, of course, were in the age group we were concerned with.** The level of public and governmental interest suggested that a well-done study of this group was likely to be given close attention.

* Except in the context of demonstration projects designed to find out whether a particular program resulted in more people finding work.

**The report was presented to the Minister of Community and Social Services in February, 1972, under the title, Report of the Task Force on Employment Opportunities for Welfare Recipients.

WHY A STUDY OF THIS KIND?

Job Seeking and Job Finding

In view of the apparent level of public interest and our belief that new data might lead to improved welfare programs, we decided to look closely at why some people got jobs and others did not.

We expected that some of the reasons would lie in how people looked for work. We also felt that how people looked for work might be changed by different welfare policies or programs. But it did not seem at all clear what kind were needed; so we decided to look at job seeking in some detail.

Changes in Job Seeking and Views of Life

A fuller picture of how job seeking is related to finding work could be gained by talking to people more than once. Levels of job seeking might change. The kind of jobs being sought might change. We could get the best data on this by talking with people more than once.

Another topic that could only be examined by doing more than one round of interviews would be changes in mood. It has quite often been said that, after a time on welfare, people are liable to become apathetic or depressed. If mood changes of this kind occur often, they warrant attention; accordingly, we wanted to know how often they took place. While we could only look at them over a brief time span, it seemed worthwhile to learn what we could.

Backgrounds and Views of Life

Whatever else we were to study, data on people's backgrounds and views of life would be highly desirable, for three main reasons.

First, this kind of information could help in interpreting other findings. For example, if we found that some of our respondents were not trying very hard to find work, it could be very helpful to know whether they felt that having a job was very important, or to know

whether they had been frequent drug users.

Second, background data would be needed to see if some groups within our sample differed from others. In a study of a group on which little research has been done before, it is particularly important to guard against over-generalizations.

Third, without information on people's backgrounds and views of life, the people being studied may be seen as members of a category, and no more. The more information of this kind you have, the easier it is to see them as people. With the right data, illustrative cases can be drawn up in enough detail to give readers a sense of what the people being studied are like as individuals.

Information on people's backgrounds and views of life can be useful in any survey. It was particularly important to us because so little was known about the group to be studied. Our conclusions would often have to stand on our data alone; in these circumstances, we wanted to gather as much data on people's backgrounds and views of life as we could get.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

As we have noted above, there were few previous studies to guide us in deciding what to include in our own. But our debts to the few available studies should be acknowledged. We do not intend to review the findings of previous studies in any detail, but appropriate comparisons with earlier work are made in Chapters 4 to 7.

1. Backgrounds and Views of Life

We are aware of only two recent Canadian studies of young people on welfare. One, done by the Canadian Council on Social Development in 1972, involved interviews with fifty young people

in each of six major cities.* The other, done by a group at the B.C. Institute of Technology in Vancouver in 1970, involved interviews with one hundred forty-one young people who had just come on welfare.**

Of the two, only the Vancouver study was available to us when our study was being developed. Some of the data it presented were very valuable in testing out our ideas on what might be studied and how.

Unfortunately, while we were very interested in such matters as how people felt about themselves, their situation, and their way of life, the Vancouver study contained few questions on such matters.

There have been quite a number of studies on the psychological characteristics of unemployed people. But we were not in a position to do the detailed psychological testing required to follow up on most of these studies. Accordingly, in the area of attitudes and psychological characteristics, we had to rely largely on our own intuition in selecting questions.

2. Job Seeking

We know of no previous studies in which a similar population has been tested to see what characteristics are associated with different levels of job seeking. For that matter, there are few published studies on this question at all. The most useful for our purposes has been reported in H.L. Shepherd and A.H. Belitsky, The Job Search.*** This study examines characteristics associated

* Canadian Council on Social Development. A Right to Opportunity - A Report on Youth and Social Assistance, Ottawa, 1972.

** Cox, J. et al. Why Do Young People Go On Welfare? B.C. Institute of Technology: Vancouver, 1971.

*** Published by John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland, 1966.

with job seeking among unemployed workers who were registered with the State Employment Service in Erie, Pennsylvania in 1963-1964.* As might perhaps be expected in a pioneering study, most of the factors shown to be related to job seeking were associated with it at a level only moderately higher than might be expected by chance.** *** As the authors have suggested, perhaps their findings should best be regarded as indicators of areas where further research could be profitable. In line with this suggestion, we have included many of the same variables in our own work.

3. Job Finding

Studies of job finding are more common. The work of Shepherd and Belitsky was again the most useful source. We were also influenced by a number of American studies dealing with factors associated with whether people on welfare obtained work. Most, unfortunately, were done with groups rather unlike our own, usually mothers receiving assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program.**** So, while suggestions for topics of study could be obtained from earlier work, we had little idea of how well they would explain success or failure in job finding in our population.

* Another study with some relevant material is reported in A. Rees and G.P. Schultz, Workers and Wages in an Urban Labor Market, University of Chicago Press, 1970.

** More technically, most were significant at only the .10 level.

*** D.R. Maki's Search Behaviour in Canadian Job Markets, published by the Economic Council of Canada in 1971, did not become available to us until after the study had begun. Fortunately, Maki's findings are similar to those of Shepherd and Belitsky. We may hope that in reacting to the latter work, we have considered most of the factors which familiarity with Maki would have led us to consider.

**** A useful review and conceptualization of this literature is found in Mildred Rein, "Determinants of the Work/Welfare Choice in AFDC", Social Service Review, Vol. 46, No. 4, December, 1972, ppg. 539-556.

4. Changes in Job Seeking and Attitudes

To our knowledge, published material on changes in job seeking over a period on welfare has been strictly impressionistic. There are many references to increasing feelings of dependency, hopelessness and fatalism as people remain on welfare over a period of time. We know of no data relating this type of change to intensity of job seeking. But it did seem appropriate to look at the possibility of a connection, even over the rather short time span we could cover.

MORE SPECIFIC TOPICS FOR STUDY

Once we had determined the major areas of study and reviewed the previous research, we could work out more specific topics for study. The topics we settled on may be seen most fully in the study questionnaires, found in Appendices B and C. But some readers may prefer to get a general picture of the topics to be studied, without going into the detail of the questionnaires. Others may want a fuller statement of our interests as background before looking at the questionnaires. For these purposes, we would like to set out some of the topics we looked at within each of the major areas of study. To give a fuller picture of our interests, we will also touch on some of the things we wanted to do with our data.

1. Backgrounds and Views of Life

In this area, there are six main groups of questions.

- a) Questions on basic demographic characteristics - age, sex and marital status.
- b) Questions on mobility - Where did you grow up? How long have you been in Hamilton? Why did you come here?, etc.
- c) Questions on the family of origin - What is your father's occupation? Has your family ever received welfare?, etc.

- d) Questions on educational and employment history - How far did you go with your schooling? Have you had any special occupational training? How many jobs have you held in the last two years?, etc.
- e) Questions about life style - How often do you go out to visit with friends? Do you use marijuana? Do you belong to any organizations?, etc.
- f) Questions on views of life - What is the most important thing in your life right now? How do you expect things will be for you five years from now? In general, how satisfied would you say you are with your life right now?, etc.

As we noted above, one reason to ask about people's backgrounds is that this type of data enables us to compare different groups. Since so little was known about the group to be studied, we planned to look at the answers to other questions in terms of at least eight of the questions on personal background.* We also intended to use this material as a basis for illustrative cases.

2. Job Seeking

We wanted to ask a number of basic questions about job seeking. For example, "How often have you gone out to look for work in the last two weeks?", "Have you registered with any employment agencies?", "What firms have you contacted?", etc. We also wanted to ask questions about things we thought might be related to job seeking. Among these were:

- a) Questions about people's backgrounds and views of life - these have been outlined above.
- b) Questions about specific job-related goals - e.g. Have you a particular type of work you are looking for? What is the minimum amount of money you would work for?

*These questions were: age, sex, amount of schooling, father's occupation, whether the respondent's family had ever been on welfare, reasons for leaving home, where the respondent had grown up, and length of time in Hamilton.

- c) Questions about more general life goals - e.g. Would you like to get married? What would make your life happier than it is now?
- d) Questions about mood states - e.g. Do you ever worry about your ability to do the things people expect of you? Does your life sometimes seem to be without purpose? How satisfied would you say you are with your way of life?
- e) Questions about personality characteristics - e.g. Do you make plans and follow them? Do you try to live in a conventional way?

We hoped we could develop an index to predict how often a person would likely go out to look for work.* If we could not, we would try to find patterns of answers which were given only by people who went out to look for work about equally often. The presence or absence of such patterns could then be the basis for predicting how often people would look for work.

3. Job Finding

The questions we thought might help to explain who found work and who did not were largely the same as the questions we thought might help us to understand how people looked for work. Here too, we hoped to find some method of prediction.

4. Changes in Job Seeking and Attitudes to Life

We could not afford to ask too many of the same questions on both interviews. So we decided that, in general, we would only look at changes in things we would be asking about for other reasons.

If the statistical prerequisites were met, we intended to

*That is, a score would be given for each answer to each of a set of questions. The scores would be summed for each person and his level of job seeking would be predicted from the total.

analyze changes in job seeking and views of life in terms of changes in other aspects of our respondents' lives.

* * * * *

Having outlined the questions to be examined, we must explain how the study was done. This will be the topic of the following chapter.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 2 - HOW THE STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Selecting The Sample	2-1
Interviewing	2-4
The Questionnaires	2-6
Data Quality	2-8
- The Questionnaire	2-8
- Interviewer Effects	2-8
- Consistency Over Time	2-9
Sample Bias	2-10
Sampling Error	2-11

CHAPTER 2

HOW THE STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT

In this chapter, we will describe how the study was carried out. In turn, we will discuss:

how our samples were selected;
how the interviews were carried out;
the quality of our data;
biases in our sample.

SELECTING THE SAMPLE

We decided whom to include in our samples on the basis of three main criteria.

- 1) Since there had been little research in this field, our conclusions would often have to stand on data from our study alone. So we wanted samples as large and as well matched with the groups from which they were drawn as possible.
- 2) The goals of the study required us to carry out at least two rounds of interviews.
- 3) We wanted to compare males with females, and short-term cases with longer-term cases.

Since we had limited resources, we had to balance these criteria. Basically, we had to decide how many rounds of interviews to do, and how to ensure that the sub-groups we wanted to compare were well represented.

We decided to do only two rounds of interviews. The costs of a third round might have forced us to reduce our sample size by as much as one-quarter. We also expected difficulties in keeping our sample

intact through more than two rounds. (As will be shown in Chapter 4, young people on welfare move very frequently.)

Since we knew each person's sex, and length of time on welfare, we could select our sample so that sub-groups defined in these terms would be well represented.

In terms of time on welfare, we decided to focus on two groups: those who had come on welfare in January of 1972, and those who, as of January 31, 1972, had been on for three months or more. The three month point was chosen mainly because, in the recent past, just over half of the single young people who came on welfare, who were not going to school, and who had no immediate prospects for getting off had found work or left the city by that point. This made it a logical dividing line between what we might call short-term and longer-term recipients.

Within each of these groups, we wanted to have at least thirty people (and preferably more) of each sex. These were the smallest numbers we felt would allow us to make the needed comparisons.

Drawing a sample that would provide enough cases in the sub-groups would pose no problems. Among those who had just come on the rolls and among females who had been on for three months or more, we would simply try to interview everyone. But there were far too many males who had been on for three months or more for us to do this with them. If we had, we would have had to reduce our interviews among the short-term cases and the female longer-term cases by two-thirds.

We decided to split the longer-term males into those who had been on for three to six months and those who had been on for more than six months. Among the three to six month cases, about one-third would be interviewed, and among those who had been on longer, about one-fifth. In each group, we would then have around forty cases.*

*Sampling different proportions from sub-groups among the longer-term cases resulted in some statistical difficulties. These are discussed in Appendix A.

To provide estimates of what the total group was like, the cases would be weighted.

How the Sample was Drawn

Two sampling methods were used: one for newcomers to the rolls and one for those who had been on longer.

Those who came on the rolls in January were told about the study by one of the Welfare Department's intake workers. It was explained that the information given to us would be confidential and would not affect anyone's status with the Welfare Department. If a person was willing to co-operate, his or her name, age, sex and address would be passed on to us. We attempted to contact everyone who was willing to co-operate.

In the case of those who had been on the rolls for three months or more, basic data - name, age, sex and address - were drawn from the Department's cardex files.* Lists of cases were drawn up. We attempted to contact all of the female cases. For the male cases, we had to draw samples. Those to be contacted were chosen by going through our lists systematically - taking one case, skipping a given number of cases, taking another, etc. Those who could not be interviewed were replaced in the same way.**

* In the case of longer-term recipients, it was impossible, for administrative reasons, to check with the recipients before making their names available to the research group. From the refusal rate, reported later in Table 2-1, it would seem that few would have objected. The cardex files, rather than the more detailed main files, were used since they contained little other than the information required for our purposes.

**Four additional cases were added to improve the match between our sample and the population in terms of age and conviction in Magistrate's Court within the preceding year.

INTERVIEWING

Before the first call, a letter was sent to explain what the study was about.* It pointed out that the interview would be confidential and mentioned that someone would be calling. Interviewers were told to explain on the first call that we would like to hold another interview in about six weeks; accordingly, no letter was sent out before the second interview.

The interviewing was carried out by six workers, the bulk of it by three of them. Four of the interviewers were given six days training. The other two, who had become familiar with the study through other channels and who had been involved in survey research before, received less intensive training.

The major problem in interviewing was with changes of address among the longer-term cases. Refusals for the first round of interviews, as shown in Table 2-1, ran at ten per cent for the short-term cases, and about five per cent for the longer-term cases. (The ratio for each group of cases is rather low for this type of research.) Refusals on the second round were very rare. Changes of address for the short-term cases were also infrequent. But for the longer-term cases, changes of address were much more common. Our best estimate is that on the first round, changes of address ran at about fifteen per cent,** and on the second at over twenty per cent.*** (The figures in Table 2-1 on page 2-5 include those who could not be located with those who had moved, since it was often difficult to be sure in which category a person fell.)

* In a small number of cases, this was not done because of administrative difficulties. The refusal rate for these cases seemed consistent with that for cases in which the letter was sent.

** It is possible that some of the people who were not located had given false addresses to the Welfare Department, but we cannot be sure how often this may have occurred.

***The figures for the first round are particularly high in view of the fact that the addresses were obtained, on the average, less than a month ahead. For the second round, we used the addresses at which people were found on the first. The time lapse was somewhat greater (an average of six weeks) but the number who had apparently moved was still very high.

TABLE 2-1Results of Interviewing Efforts -
First Round of Interviews

<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of eligible respondents	65	45	110
Number interviewed	52	38	90*
Number who had left the community**	3	1	4
Number who had moved or could not be located	2	3	5
Number who refused	8	3	11
 <u>Longer-Term Cases</u>			
Number of eligible respondents	316	69	385
Number selected for sampling	160	69	229
Number interviewed	78	44	122*
Number who had left the community**	10	3	13
Number who had moved or could not be located	66***	18	84
Number who refused	6	4	10

* A few more people were interviewed, but proved to be ineligible for the sample. (Clerical errors had resulted in their being included among the cases from which the sample was drawn.)

** This figure includes those who had moved from the city, those who had been jailed, and those who had entered a psychiatric hospital.

***A number of males who had been on welfare 3-4 months could not be called on more than once or twice for lack of time. Had it been possible to call on these people a few more times, perhaps ten or eleven more would have been contacted.

The interviews, themselves, went quite smoothly. A few people were slow to grasp the meaning of questions, but the interviewers were almost always able to explain what was meant. Only very rarely did anyone refuse to answer a question. The interviewers said that, as a rule, their rapport with the people they talked to was very good.

THE QUESTIONNAIRES

The questionnaires were kept to a length such that they could be completed in just over one hour. In some studies, interviews longer than this have resulted in people's becoming fatigued or losing interest. We were also concerned that some people might not see the point of some of the questions and might, on that account, give less than full co-operation. Our caution forced us to omit some questions we would have liked to ask, but we had no apparent problems either with particular questions or with the length of the interviews.

Two-thirds of the questions for the first round of interviews dealt with personal background, employment history, and job seeking efforts. Further questions were asked on use of leisure time, psychological characteristics and views of life.

The questions on psychological characteristics and views of life require some comment. The section on psychological characteristics, questions 50-61, is based on unpublished work by the writer. While the theory they were designed to test is more complex, they deal, broadly speaking, with vitality and self-control. It was hoped that these items might give us some insight into job seeking or job finding. The section on views of life, questions 62-72, consists of items drawn from Srole's Anomia Scale* or from the Life Satisfaction Indices

*Srole, Leo, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study", American Sociological Review, 21, Dec., 1956, pp. 709-716.

developed by Neugarten, et al.* It was hoped that these items would tell us something about the important things in a person's emotional life, and that they would pick up any marked states of mood, for example, depression or anxiety, that might be hindering someone from seeking or finding work.

On the second round, two questionnaires were used. A very brief one was used with people who had found work before our first call. A broader questionnaire, about the same length as the one for the first round, was used for the rest of the sample.

About one-third of the items from the first questionnaire were kept in the longer second round questionnaire. In some cases, we wanted to make comparisons, e.g., in frequency of looking for work. In other cases, we wanted to check for consistency, as in the case of age, and level of education. In other cases, we wanted to see whether people's opinions or views of life had changed.

About one-sixth of the items from the first questionnaire were used again in a slightly modified form. This was done for one of two reasons. Sometimes we wanted to follow developments since the first interview. For example, on the first round, a question was asked as to how many firms a person had contacted in the last three months (or since he became unemployed). On the second round, we asked how many firms had been contacted in the meantime. Sometimes we simply wanted to ask for more detail.

About one-half of the questions from the first questionnaire were dropped. The ones cut out included those on personal history and psychological characteristics. These questions were replaced with new items, mostly to do with views of life.

*The latter items were designed to measure life satisfaction among the elderly. We selected items we believed were applicable to our own population. The Indices may be found in B.L. Neugarten, et al., "The Measurement of Life Satisfaction", Gerontology, 1961, pp. 134-143.

One series of questions, numbers 66-78, requires some comment. These thirteen items, in a more complex form, have been used in a number of studies to compare the values people attach to different ways of living.* They were reworded because, in their original form, they appeared much too complex and too abstract to be used with our respondent group.

DATA QUALITY

Before using our data, we had to check its quality. What we did will be touched on briefly here.

1. The Questionnaire

Each questionnaire was checked to be sure that all questions were answered, and that the answers were clear and consistent. In doubtful cases, the interviewers were asked about what they had been told. In a few cases, the respondents were contacted to clear up uncertain points.

2. Interviewer Effects

Each question was checked to see if the interviewers had been given the same types of answers. When differences appeared that could not be readily explained, the interviewers were asked how they had recorded the answers they were given, how they explained the question to people who were not sure they understood it, and the like. On a few questions, it appeared that an interviewer had biased the results. Where there is reason to believe that this has occurred, it will be noted when figures on the responses appear in the text for the first time.**

* For the original items, and the rationale for their development, see L.V. Jones and C. Morris, "Value Scales and Dimensions", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 1955, pp. 523-35.

**More detail on interviewer effects will be found in Appendix A.

3. Consistency Over Time

Testing for consistency from one interview to another depends on questions to which there are "correct" answers such as age, place of birth, and the like. We asked a good number of questions of this kind on our first call. But we did not want to waste time asking questions twice if we did not need to; we decided to check only age, when people had left home, and how far they had gone with their schooling. Checking a small number of questions in this way cannot, of course, tell us whether people gave us the truth. But it can, at least, give us a hint as to whether people were giving us stories on one occasion which they could not keep straight on another.

Answers to the question on age either remained the same, or increased by one year. Changes were few enough in number to be explained quite readily by birthdays between our calls. The answers to the question on when people had left home were also quite stable. In the few cases where the answers were different, what had usually happened was that someone who had come to Hamilton from outside of Ontario had interpreted leaving home, on one occasion, to mean leaving his native province or country.

Answers to the question on education changed in ten per cent of the cases. Usually, the answer given did not fit into the categories we were using very well, and was not handled the same way by the two interviewers.

Five cases could not be explained this way. In these cases, the answers differed by only one category, usually between "some high school, but Grade 10 incomplete" and "Grade 10, but high school incomplete". A mistake could have been made if a statement like "I went as far as Grade 10" was not followed up to see if the Grade had been completed.

We decided to check with the Canada Manpower Centre, and to take the answer that agreed with their data. Three cases were

assigned to the higher category, two to the lower.

All told, then, while there were problems here, they were not great. We deliberately tested education because it might be miscoded, and because people without work might be inclined to distort their education; so the data seemed basically sound.

SAMPLE BIAS

We were able to match our samples against the groups from which they were drawn on three things - age, where they lived within the city, and whether or not they had been convicted in Magistrate's Court (in Hamilton) in the preceding year. On age and where people lived within the city, the match was close.* In the case of convictions in Magistrate's Court, the longer-term sample showed a good match, but our short-term sample did not. There were too few people who had been convicted in our short-term sample.

Further analysis suggested that the effects of this bias should not be great, and that, accordingly, we should not be too concerned about it. In any event, if there appears reason to believe that this bias may have changed the proportion of those replying to a question who gave a particular response by three per cent or more, this will be noted when the answers to the question are discussed.**

The reader should bear in mind one other source of bias. Those who were interviewed on the second round were lower in education and level of job seeking than those who were not re-interviewed. We could find no other items that significantly differentiated those who were interviewed once from those who were interviewed twice and that were associated with any number of the questions that were asked only on the second round. Where it appears that the bias noted might have changed the proportion giving a particular answer by more than two or three per cent, this will be noted.

* More formally, the differences between our samples and the populations from which they were drawn were not significant at the .05 level.

**More detail on this question is found in Appendix A.

SAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of our results does not depend only on known biases. Perhaps the sample does not match well with the total group in ways which could not be checked. There is no way to be certain.

But we can work out how likely it is that our sample differs from the total group to any given degree. Suppose that fifty per cent of single young people on welfare, for example, were looking for a specific type of work. How close to fifty per cent of the people in our samples could be expected to have a specific type of work in mind?

In the case of those who came on the rolls in January, we had talked to ninety people out of one hundred ten. In this case, the odds are about twenty-four to one that our sample would be in error by five per cent or less.*

In the case of those who had been on the rolls for three months or more, the odds are about nineteen to one that figures for the group on the rolls for three months or more would be in error by nine per cent or less.

On the second round, since our samples were reduced in size, the likely range of error is greater. For the short-term cases, the odds are somewhat greater than nineteen to one that the figures will be in error by ten per cent or less. For the longer-term cases, the odds are just under nineteen to one that the figures will be in error by thirteen per cent or less.

The reader should note that these are outside limits. The likely range of error, in percentage terms, will never be greater, and will often be substantially less, depending on the percentage in the population who have a particular characteristic.

*Suppose we were to draw a great many samples of ninety from a group of one hundred ten. Then, ninety-six per cent of the samples would give a figure between forty-five per cent and fifty-five per cent. So the odds are about twenty-four to one that the figure from our sample would lie in this range.

Most other aspects of the analysis of the data are straightforward. We will need to explain how our illustrative cases were drawn up and how job seeking and job finding were analyzed. But these explanations are needed only for specific chapters; they will be given later in the chapters to which they apply.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 3 - ILLUSTRATIVE CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Case No. 1 - A Young Man Who Lived For The Moment . . .	3-4
Case No. 2 - A Young Woman Who Hated Being on Welfare .	3-7
Case No. 3 - A Young Man Who Found Work Quickly	3-10
Case No. 4 - A Young Man Who Wanted a Stabler Existence	3-12
Case No. 5 - A Young Man With Foreign Training	3-15
Case No. 6 - A Young Woman Who Got Further Training . .	3-17
Case No. 7 - A Disillusioned Young Man	3-19
Case No. 8 - A Young Man Who Was Basically Satisfied With His Situation	3-21
Case No. 9 - A Young Man With Physical Limitations . .	3-23

CHAPTER 3

ILLUSTRATIVE CASES

In this chapter, we will present a series of illustrative cases. We hope these will give the reader some feel for the kind of people who were on welfare when we did this study.

To do this, we needed a method of choosing cases. We decided to select them in two different ways.

To begin with, we chose a series of basic questions from among those we had asked. Where more than two answers were possible, answers were grouped to reduce the possibilities to two, or in a few cases to three. For each question, the modal answer was selected. Then we could see how closely any person's answers matched with this set of average answers. We could also see how closely one person's answers matched with any other person's.

This gave us two possible types of illustration. We could select people whose answers matched as closely as possible with the set of average answers. We could also select people whose patterns of answers were similar to the patterns given by large numbers of other people.

First of all, we had to decide which questions should be included. Probably few people would chose exactly the same list. But it seems likely that there would be general agreement that the questions we have chosen are important. The ones we have used are as follows:

Questions on Demographic Characteristics

Sex

Age (Respondents were divided into three groups on this question.)

Questions on Personal Background

How far did you go with your schooling? (Respondents were divided into three groups on this question.)

Have your parents ever been on welfare?

When did you leave home? (The division here was between those who had left and those who had not.)

How many (full-time) jobs have you had before? (The division here was between those who had had full-time jobs and those who had not.)

Questions Related to Job-Seeking

Have you a particular kind of work you are looking for?

How often have you been out looking for work in the last two weeks? (Respondents were split into three groups on this question.)

Have your friends suggested places where you might look for work?

Questions on Life Style

How frequently do you drink alcohol?

How frequently do you use marijuana?

Do you want to get married?

I try to live in a conventional way. (Agree-disagree)

I often find it difficult to think of something I feel like doing. (Agree-disagree)

Questions on Attitudes to Life

A series of questions on attitudes to life was asked. Scores were given for the presence in the answers of the following:

- trust for other people
- desire for intimate human relations (ordinarily, marriage)
- desire for a job
- desire for material success
- contentment with life in the present situation
- a tendency to live day by day

With this list of questions, perfect agreement with the average set of answers, or with another individual, would result in a score of twenty-three. Complete disagreement would result in a score of zero. The mean score in either case would be about thirteen.

For purposes of this chapter, we will be treating our sample of newcomers to the rolls separately from our sample of longer-term cases. For each group, we will present the one case which most closely matched the set of average answers. We will also present a series of cases which

are typical in the sense that many other cases gave similar patterns of answers. To be considered similar, two sets of answers had to match at least sixteen times.

These cases were selected stepwise. That is, the first case chosen was the one similar to the highest number of other cases. The second case chosen was the one which was similar to the highest possible number of cases other than those matched with the first two. And so on.

The cases presented for both the newcomers and the longer-term cases, taken together, have at least sixteen matched answers with two-thirds of the cases in the sample. If we raise the number of matched answers to seventeen, then the cases presented are similar to only about one-half the cases in the sample. If the number of matched answers was raised further, the number with which one or more of the illustrations was paired would drop off very rapidly.*

This results from the basic diversity of the sample. There is no case of two individuals showing more than twenty similar answers. Only about one-third of the cases among either the newcomers or longer-term cases are matched at a level of eighteen or more with any of the other cases. So while the cases we will be presenting are, by the criteria we have used, the best possible illustrations, it must be borne in mind that no group of nine cases could give more than a quite general

*It had originally been hoped that after employing some form of cluster analysis, we might simply select one case from each cluster as an illustration. The problem was that an intuitively satisfactory level of homogeneity in clusters could not be obtained for more than about one-half the cases. Few of the clusters contained more than six cases. A related problem arose when we attempted to break the population down by sex, by age (dichotomized) and by education (dichotomized), and to draw up composite cases within these categories. The composites, unfortunately, often showed little resemblance to the actual cases because of the diversity within each category. When this approach failed, we decided to fall back on the method set out here.

feel for a group so diverse. It must also be noted that while the cases we have chosen are representative by the criteria we have used, they may be quite idiosyncratic in other ways. For each case, we will try to point out any major respects in which the case is clearly atypical.

With these cautions, let us turn to our cases.

* * * * *

We will begin with the newcomers to the rolls. Among these cases, Jim D.* was the single individual whose answers matched most closely with the set of average answers. In this sense, he is the most typical of the newcomers to the rolls.

CASE NO. 1 - A Young Man Who Lived for the Moment

When we first talked to Jim D., he had been on welfare for just two weeks. He had been working as a labourer in construction. As he explained it, he could not get along too well with the boss, so he had been laid off. This had been the fourth job he had had since he had left school two years earlier, but he had not been on welfare before. He had always been able to find work quickly.

He had left school without completing Grade 10 because, he said, it bored him. He wanted to be active, to be doing something with his hands. His mother, who felt that he would be happier working, had not discouraged him from quitting. His father, who had a professional job, felt Jim should try to go farther. But he had not had much influence on the decision, since he lived apart from the rest of the family and saw Jim only irregularly. Jim's friends did not care much one way or the other.

The main thing Jim did not like about being on welfare was the shortage of ready cash. He could not spend as much as he

*All names used for illustrative cases are fictitious.

would have liked to on entertainment or on clothing and he could not afford cigarettes. ("Having to bum them from my friends makes me feel cheap.") Otherwise his standard of living had not changed much. He lived at home with his mother, so he had all the conveniences he had been used to, and he enjoyed living there.

There was another drawback to being on welfare. He said he felt bored sitting around with no work to do, and sometimes he got depressed about it. He also felt that the welfare system should be changed so that people would be given jobs instead of handouts, because the present system allows people to be lazy.

But he did not feel any sense of stigma. His friends did not care one way or the other. (Many were on welfare themselves.) His mother, while unhappy about his being on welfare, felt it was the only thing he could do.

All told, apart from the difference in income, he said he thought it was better to be on welfare than working.

Whatever his feelings about welfare, when we talked to him just after he had come on the rolls, he had been out looking for work three times in the preceding two weeks. When we talked to him again six weeks later, he had not been looking for work for some time because an accident had left him unable to do the kind of work he had done before. Since he wanted to go back into the same kind of job, he felt that he would have to wait until he was back to normal.

His method of job seeking, when he had been looking, had been a mixture of contacting individual firms where he thought there might be openings with picking particular areas and knocking on every door within them. On two occasions, he had had referrals from Manpower, but he was not optimistic about finding a job through that source. He told us he felt they "should get off their asses and help people. They have a 'just look through the yellow pages' attitude."*

*Comments on agencies which are quoted are, unless otherwise noted, the opinions of the respondents only, and not those of the writer or of the Social Planning and Research Council.

He was not very specific about the type of work he was looking for, except that he would prefer to be in construction. He was willing to work for about \$100 a week, which was about what he had been making before he was laid off, and about what most of the people he knew who were his own age were making.

He felt that his chances of getting a job, once he was able to work again, were good. If he could find a job, he would be able to get most of what he wanted in life. When we asked him what could make him happier than he was at present, he replied, "a good job, money in my pocket, and a car to give me freedom". All of these would be possible if he could get work.

This point of view seemed tied in with a basic belief that the way to live was to get as much pleasure as possible from the present moment. He said that he hadn't thought much about the future. He described himself as impulsive and enthusiastic about many things. He was out with friends almost every night. He said on our first call that the most important things in his life at the moment were having fun and enjoying his life as a single man. The most enjoyable things in his life so far had been the good times he had had with his friends at school, especially "bugging the teachers", and his relationships with girls. (On the second call, he was more specific. The most important thing in his life was "sex", and the most satisfying things so far had been "good loves".)

His desire for as much immediate pleasure as he could get seemed to stem from some other important elements in his view of the world. One of these was that he had little sense of purpose. "I get depressed at times. There's too much boredom. It's a drag." Then, too, he was reluctant to trust other people. "Everybody tries to fuck you up somehow. They're only out for what they can get." His caution about other people seemed to be rooted in experience, particularly with his family. His parents' separation had been bitter, and, as he put it, "Family problems

can shoot you down so bad you don't know where you're going."

Now, if a person sees little purpose in his life, has not thought much about the future, and finds it hard to trust other people, there is not much left that is likely to seem rewarding to him except short term pleasures. So Jim's emphasis on enjoying life here and now seems understandable.

But the future is inevitable, and he was gradually beginning to think about what he wanted the rest of his life to be like.

In the long term, though he had not thought about it much, he thought that he would like to settle down. He would like to get a steady job and probably get married. In the short term, he thought that common law arrangements had a lot going for them. You could get out easily and "you don't get bored looking at the same scenery". In the longer term, he felt that a stable relationship with a family would be best for him, although he was not ready for it yet.

* * * * *

Although Jim was closer to the set of average answers than anyone else among our sample of newcomers to the rolls, there were several other people who had a greater number of matches with other people. Jane M. had more than anyone else. Among the eighty-nine other people in the sample, thirty-two gave at least sixteen of the same answers. In this sense, she is the most typical of the newcomers to the rolls.

CASE NO. 2 - A Young Woman Who Hated Being on Welfare

Jane M. came to Hamilton in the summer of 1971. She had come here after completing high school, because she felt job opportunities would be better. She found a job, made friends, and

became engaged to a young man one of her girlfriends at work had introduced her to. Then, in December, she was told that her job was going to be eliminated at the beginning of the year.

When we talked to her the first time, she had been on welfare for ten days. In the meantime, she had had one referral from Manpower and had contacted two firms herself with no luck. She had been looking for office work, for which she had been trained, but said that if she could not get it, she would be quite willing to work in a factory or as a salesclerk. The only types of work that she said she would not do were door-to-door sales and waitressing. The minimum income she would work for would be around \$70 a week, which was about what she had been earning before.

Jane definitely did not like being on welfare. She had avoided telling her parents, because she was embarrassed about it. She felt she needed more money for new glasses and for entertainment. It was even hard to find money for bus fare to go for interviews. She told us, "I hate doing the same thing every day. Sometimes I feel my life is really useless. I would like to be accomplishing something."

Her strong dislike for sitting around was probably related to her temperament. The interviewer said that she appeared to be very high strung. She described herself as being very self-conscious and always worrying about what was going to happen the next day. "I worry about what people are thinking about me - whether or not they're going to like me. Sometimes I hurt people even when I don't want to." For someone with such a nervous temperament, something to keep busy with would seem to be necessary to maintain peace of mind.

In most respects, Jane was a most conventional person. She said that she tried to live in a conventional way and that she tried to make sure that what she did was in good taste. She drank alcohol only occasionally and never used drugs. (She had tried

soft drugs in her middle teens but had given them up.) She was strongly opposed to living together without being married. For the future, she wanted, and expected, a comfortable and secure life with a husband and family.

When we spoke with her, her fiancé and plans for marriage were the things uppermost in her mind. She felt that getting married meant greater emotional security, and that it was the natural outcome of the trust and the love she and her fiancé felt for each other.

A few weeks after we talked to her, she went back to her home town to visit with her family. When she returned, she was to be married shortly. Her husband would be supporting her, so she had no further need for welfare.

At that point, she was tied up with preparations for the wedding, but she hoped that, after the honeymoon, she would be able to find a job. She did not want to have children for several years, until they had saved enough money for a house. In the meantime, she hoped to be able to improve her job qualifications by taking business courses. Then, when she went back to work after her children were all in school, she would be able to get a job that she would really enjoy over the long term.

* * * * *

In the first two of our illustrative cases, people were unable to find work over the course of the study. This was the case with about two-thirds of the people we talked to. But some others found work quite quickly. Michael D. was one of these.

While his speed in finding work was unusual, he was a quite typical case in other respects. Thirty-one other people gave the same answer to at least sixteen questions. Fifteen of these people had not matched as well with Jane M.

CASE NO. 3 - A Young Man Who Found Work Quickly

Michael D. had scarcely been on welfare when he was off again. He had come from the Maritimes to look for work, and found a job three days after he had come on welfare. He started work the next week, so he got only one welfare cheque.

Even one week was more than enough time on welfare for Mike. He told us that "you get bored sitting around and there is not enough money to pay a week's rent and to get food." But although he himself had disliked being on welfare, and he felt that changes for the benefit of the recipients should be made, the major changes he would like to make would make it harder for people to get on. "I figure a lot of people are on who shouldn't really get it. I figure they need better investigation. The chances are there if you take advantage of them. People have to make it on their own. If you look hard enough for a job, then you find one."

He had been able to find work quickly in an apprenticeship program because he had done some related work before and had gotten into the right union. He had liked the work for the variety and sense of productivity involved in it, and had been looking for something similar. He would have stayed with his last job, but the firm he was working for had had a downturn in business, and had to lay off some of its workers.

Mike said that he felt that he had been lucky in life so far. "I started out with a good family. I got lucky and got into the union. I wouldn't change anything."

In a way, he did seem to have been lucky. He had dropped out of school after Grade 10 because he was "sick and tired of school". He had worked a while in his father's business but had found it boring. He had occasionally dropped acid, although he had always been cautious about getting in too deep. Now a lot

of people who do not like school, leave without completing secondary school, experiment with drugs, and do not enjoy their first experience with full-time work might be expected to have employment problems later. Mike had not. Once he found the kind of work he wanted to do, everything had been fine.

Perhaps one reason things had worked out for him was, as he said, that he had started from a good family. He said that among the things that had given him the greatest pleasure in life were good times with his brothers and sisters and the family reunions that had taken place since they had begun to leave home. As a result of his warm family life, he wanted to get married himself and to have a fairly large family. The only negative factor he could see in getting married was the probability of being nagged.

For the time being, though, he wasn't in a hurry to get married. He did say that the one thing that would make him happier would be "a nice chick". But the important thing was to complete his apprenticeship. After that, he might like to get some more education, perhaps to enter university as a mature student. Whether he did this or not, he expected that in five years' time he would be more settled down, and perhaps be ready to get married.

For the time being, though, he wasn't worrying about this sort of thing, or about anything else. "I've got a roof over my head, food in my stomach, and good friends. I know where I'm going. Right now, I'm happy."

* * * * *

Michael D. knew where he was going, but a lot of people we talked to did not. Most said they lived from day to day without doing much thinking about the future. On the other hand, some of them very much wanted a sense of direction. Tom Y. was one of these. Although

he was unusual in this respect, he was very typical in others. Twenty-three of the other people in the sample gave the same answers to at least sixteen questions. Ten of these people had not matched as well with either of the preceding cases.

CASE NO. 4 - A Young Man Who Wanted a Stabler Existence

When we met Tom Y., he was living on the third floor of a boarding house, where he had moved just after being laid off from his previous job. His income had dropped sharply when he went on welfare, so he could not afford to stay where he was. But he said he liked the other guys in the house, and the landlady was easy to get along with, so he was happy in his new location.

He was used to moving around anyway. This was his third place of residence in two years. He was used to boarding as well. He had left home five years ago, while he was still in high school, because he just could not get along with his parents. Looking back, he said that the one thing he would like to change in his life so far had been his home life. He saw his older brother fairly often, but, although his parents lived nearby, he saw them less than once a month. He'd heard they were upset to hear he was on welfare, but he "couldn't care less" what they thought.

After he had left home, he had finished high school, and gone on to complete a course at a community college. He would have liked to have gone on to university, he said, but he didn't want to try a longer course because he had to support himself. But he had enjoyed his schooling and thought he might like to go back in a few years.

The things he had enjoyed most in life were the trips he had been able to take during the summer when he was in school (he had tried to get jobs away from Hamilton if he could), and living the single life as a teenager.

In the present, he was, in most respects, content. He had good friends. He spent two nights a week in sports leagues. There were no pressures on him and he had no worries "except for girl problems - but most guys have those".

The one source of discontent in his life was being on welfare. He appeared to be quite embarrassed about it. He said he could hardly live on what he was given and it was hard on him psychologically. He said that "it's great for the first little while, but after a while you have to do something. When you are unemployed, you start to get depressed and lazy and to lose interest in life."

When we talked to him the first time, he was going out to look for work at least every other day. He was dividing his calls about evenly between firms where he could use his community college training and construction firms. He had been out of the community college for two years but he had been unable to find work in the field he was trained for, so he had worked in construction. But he was still hopeful about finding something that would make use of his training.

Basically, he had enjoyed working in construction. The only thing he had not liked was working with so many "foreign, ignorant bastards". In his last job, he had been getting paid \$120 a week. This was his income target for his next job. He was willing to work for a bit less, but there were some kinds of work he would not take, outdoor labouring in winter for one.

Whatever the limits on the work he would take, he was looking harder than most of the other people that we talked to, and, shortly after we talked with him a second time, he found a job with a building firm.

This meant a great deal to him because, as he said on our first interview, the most important thing in his life right then was "to find a job I'll be happy with. Stable employment leads

to a stabler existence. Everything else would fit into place after that."

But while he was glad to have a job, he had decided, after spending three months looking for one, that there was little chance of finding work in the field for which he was trained in or near Hamilton. He planned to move after the summer.

Over the long term, he had very few plans. He expected that in five years he would probably be married, with a couple of kids. He liked the idea of regular companionship, regular sex and having children. Right now, the idea of marriage seemed a little frightening, since he did not have the kind of work he wanted and the employment situation seemed uncertain.

In fact, a lot of things seemed uncertain to him. When we asked him if he thought the lot of the average person was getting better or worse, he said that "definitely getting worse. Everybody is falling apart, turning to drink or drugs, or going after everybody else's wife. Everything is getting more expensive. People are worrying more. Compatibility between people is getting scarcer."

But yet, for himself over the longer term, he seemed optimistic. He expected to be able to find a good wife, get a good job, and live a fairly comfortable life.

* * * * *

If we had gone one step further, then the next case in line would have been Jim D., our first illustrative case, who also showed the highest agreement with the set of average answers. There were five people who gave sixteen or more of the same answers, who had not done so with the preceding three cases. Thus, the four cases we have presented matched at this level with more than two-thirds of the others in the sample. The addition of further illustrations would have raised this proportion only very slightly. So, by the standards we have used, the four cases we have presented will represent the kind of people who

are among the newcomers to the rolls about as well as they can be represented.

A set of five cases will do the same thing for the longer-term cases. As we did with the shorter-term cases, let us begin with the person who showed the greatest agreement with the set of average answers. This will be Tom G. His level of education was unusual, and led to some other differences from others in the sample. But otherwise he gave a very close match to the set of average answers.

CASE NO. 5 - A Young Man With Foreign Training

Tom G. had been on welfare just over three months when we talked to him in the middle of February. In the past three months, he had contacted some forty-five firms looking for work. He had registered with two employment agencies (besides Manpower), and had scattered resumés among firms that he had not contacted directly. But he had not found an opening.

His difficulty appeared to lie mainly in the fact that his post secondary technical training had not been taken in Canada. No one here wanted to hire him at a level appropriate to his qualifications, because they did not know what to make of his training, or because his Canadian experience was limited. (He had worked in Canada for fifteen months but it was on a time-limited project.) People were cautious about hiring him at a lower level for fear he would leave quickly. At least this was how it appeared to him.

He said that he would be willing to take any kind of work that used his training, even at a level below his qualifications, or in a field in which he had not worked before. He would be willing to work for around \$500 a month. (Writer's note: If his training had been accepted as equal to Canadian training, he could probably have gotten 75% more.)

He was clearly unhappy about his employment situation. Being unproductive bothered him. His parents were worried about what was happening to him in a new country. His friends were disappointed that he could not find work. While he could make ends meet on a welfare budget, he had nothing left over for entertainment. He said that the most important thing in his life at that point was to get a job.

He said that, while he was not at all satisfied with his situation, he forced himself not to become bitter or depressed about it. Although he rated his chances of getting work of the kind he would prefer over the next three months as only fair, he felt that sooner or later he was bound to come up with something.

Perhaps his dissatisfaction with his employment situation was magnified by his social situation. None of his family were in Canada. He had not made many friends here, and he knew only a few girls. So his life was more focussed on work than it might otherwise have been.

Unlike most other people we talked to, he spent much of his time during the day reading. He was, in effect, furthering his education in the field in which he had been trained. He had thought of taking some further training in Canada to improve his chances on the job market.

This would depend on how successful he was in finding work. If he could find something that used his training and that held out a promise of advancement, he would probably stay with it indefinitely.

As it happened, he found a job that suited him just before the second time we called on him. He was to start the following week. It was not at the level he had been trained for, but it met his minimum salary requirements, it promised to be interesting, and he hoped it would serve as a stepping stone to something better.

If Tom G.'s problem was that his training had been taken in another country, Joan T.'s problem was that she had not taken the right kind of training in Canada. But she got further training through Manpower. This led to her finding a job. This did not happen to many others, but, by the criteria we were using, she was the most typical of our longer-term cases. Thirty-two out of the sample of one hundred twenty-two gave the same answers at least sixteen times.

CASE NO. 6 - A Young Woman Who Got Further Training

Joan T. had been on welfare for just over three months when we talked to her. She told us, "It's horrible on welfare! My parents think I'm a bum. Other people can buy clothes and records and stereo equipment and go out more than I do."

Although she had been on for three months and had been unable to find the office work she had been looking for, she was optimistic that she would be off welfare before long, because Manpower had just agreed to place her in a training program. She expected that, having completed it, she would be able to find work quickly.

She had been out looking for work twice in the preceding two weeks. As she had been since she became unemployed, she had been concentrating on office work. The four jobs she had had since she completed high school had all been in office work, and she had taken training for it in high school, so she felt her chances were best there. But she would be willing to do other things, for example, to work in a retail store. There was only one type of work she spontaneously could think of that she would not do; "I would not be a waitress! It is worse than slavery!"

Apart from being on welfare, she was quite satisfied with her life; "I make sure I never get depressed. Nobody can bring me down. I stay away from depressing thoughts, I wouldn't

change the way my life has been. I have had a good time." The only things she could think of that would improve her life would be to get a good job with enough money to do the things she wanted to do, and to get married. She wanted to get married primarily for companionship and for someone to love and be loved by. She said that right now her life sometimes seemed to be without purpose because "I don't have anybody to care about". Our interviewer described her as very shy. She said of herself that she was the "quiet, sympathetic" type, so she thought a life of comfortable domesticity seemed the right thing for her.

For her own life, she was optimistic. She expected that in five years time, she would probably have a good job, a husband and a comfortable life. She was less optimistic about the world in general. She saw people becoming more and more alienated, international tensions rising, the cost of living going up so quickly that both husband and wife would have to work.

In the present, she was receiving her major satisfaction from her friends. She lived in a boarding house, so she could not have people in too often, but she was out visiting or going places with people almost every night. Her friends were unhappy about her being on welfare but they did not blame her for it. She said that she had always had good friends. The most enjoyable things in her life had been trips she had taken with them in the past.

When we talked to her the second time, she had finished training and was actively looking for work. She had contacted six firms in the preceding week and had another interview lined up for the following week. Although she did not expect to make much more money than she had on her previous job, about \$70 a week, she did not really want to make a lot of money, and she felt that her chances of getting a job were much better. Two weeks later she found a job.

In spite of her disappointment about not finding work, Joan managed to keep her morale up. Some others were not so lucky. Jim K. seemed to be thoroughly disillusioned with life, although it was not very clear whether this was a cause of his being on welfare or a result of it, or both. Not too many people were as thoroughly unhappy as he was, but many approached it. All told, thirty-one people gave at least sixteen of the same answers as he did. Twenty-two of these were people who had not matched as well with Joan T.

CASE NO. 7 - A Disillusioned Young Man

Jim K. had just turned eighteen. He had been out of school for just over a year. He had been in a special program for people who could not progress at the normal rate. He said that he had left school "because they didn't teach you anything". His parents had agreed and had not encouraged him to stay. Probably because of his inability to learn quickly, he had never been able to get a full-time job. His parents and friends appeared to be resigned to this situation, although they, of course, would have preferred him to find work. His parents' acceptance of the situation may have been made easier by the fact that they had been on welfare for some time.

Jim was hoping to get a job soon because he said, "I'd rather work for my own money. You get bored sitting around. I want to get a job and get out of here." By "out of here" he meant that he would like to leave home.

He wanted to do this, not because he did not get along with his parents in general, but because he felt they were not giving him credit for growing up. It wasn't a matter of rebellion in the usual sense. He had never taken drugs, drank alcohol only rarely, and did not believe in premarital sex. Rather, he said, "My parents get on my back a lot. They try to tell me who to see. They think I am still a small child and treat me that way."

He was unhappy with the Welfare Department, too. "They make it seem like the money they are giving you comes out of their own pockets. They ask you what you do with your money. They say they are trying to help us, but they don't."*

For that matter he was not very cheerful about his own past, or optimistic about his future. When we asked him what had been the most satisfying things in his life so far, he replied, "Not much." He felt that in general he had had fewer breaks than most people, and things seemed to be getting worse. "As a small lad, you have a nice and easy life. As you grow up, it gets rougher." When we asked him how he thought things would be for him in five years, on the first interview he answered, "Miserable". On the second interview, he was a bit more optimistic, "I might have a good job."

Apart from work, he had no real idea of what his future would hold. He did not want to marry. There just did not seem to be anything attractive about it. He had no ideas about wanting to travel or any strong desire to take up new activities.

He hadn't any clear ideas about work either, but he had given the matter a certain amount of thought. He had had some vocational training in school, and would have liked to work in the field he had trained for. But he would be quite happy to work as a janitor, or on a factory line, or just about anywhere else as long as it paid \$100 a week or more. The only things he wouldn't do, he said, were to wait on tables or to wash dishes.

Since he had no very definite type of work in mind, his pattern of job-seeking seemed haphazard. He would check one firm on one occasion and another in a completely different field on another occasion, just looking wherever it seemed to him there might be an opening. Over the period he had been on welfare up to our second interview, he checked on the average with one firm a week.

*These views are the views of the respondent.

Altogether then, it may seem understandable that by the end of April, just over six months from the time he came on welfare, he had not found work. He was looking in an unsystematic way. His education was very low. He seemed disillusioned with the world. All of these things might have worked against him.

* * * * *

As we have mentioned above, and as might have been gathered from the other cases we have presented, Jim K.'s discouragement with life was unusually strong. A much more common situation was that of someone who would rather not have been on welfare but who, all things considered, was basically content with his situation. Bob J. was one of these. There were twenty-two other people who matched at least sixteen of his answers. Eighteen of these people had not matched as well with either of the preceding cases.

CASE NO. 8 - A Young Man Who Was Basically Satisfied With His Situation

Bob J. had come onto welfare reluctantly. He was living at home so his expenses were low. He had been earning a bit of money from part-time work since he left school the preceding summer. His part-time work, although it was irregular, would pay for his food and his mother didn't want to charge him rent. But he just couldn't afford to buy clothes. His mother couldn't help out because she was on Mother's Allowance and had no leeway in her budget. So, although he hadn't wanted to do it, he went on welfare himself.

When we talked to him, he told us that things were going well for him. He was enjoying his part-time job, he had a girl-friend and he was out with her or some of the guys practically every night. He was enjoying living at home.

His major source of discontent at the moment was that he did not have a car. The main thing he did not like about not working full-time was that he could not build up the money he needed to buy one.

He said that he would prefer to work in retail sales or in a restaurant. He had done a little of each in the past and neither had high educational requirements. (He had completed elementary school.) In the two weeks before we talked to him the first time, he had been to two firms to see if they needed anyone. This was a higher level of job seeking than was usual for him. He said that over the preceding three months, he had contacted only two other firms. In the six weeks between interviews, he had not contacted anyone.

This low level of job seeking might seem surprising in view of his reluctance to come on welfare, and of his desire for more money. It seems that other things were reducing his efforts. He hoped that he would eventually be able to get more work in the field in which he was working part-time. A second reason was his lack of self-confidence. He had not done well in school, and said that he was not "good at remembering what people ask me to do" - so he became anxious about following instructions. The third reason seemed to be that, while he wanted more money, he was not as unhappy with his situation as many others. He did not find himself feeling bored, because he could keep himself busy with other interests. He had plenty of friends, so he did not feel the need for contact with co-workers. He felt no stigma at being on welfare. In general, he felt that things were going pretty well for him.

Partially because he was unsure about his future employment, he was uncertain what the future was likely to bring. On one occasion, he told our interviewer that he thought that in five years things probably wouldn't be much better for him than they were now. On the other, he said that things would be much better, because by then he'd probably have all the things he had ever wanted. But he wasn't worried about it. He didn't like to think very much, and he was comfortable in his present situation. So why worry?

* * * * *

The last of our illustrative cases is George B. George was unusual in that he was one of the few people we talked to who had important health problems. Otherwise he was not at all unusual. Nineteen others matched his answers at least sixteen times. Twelve of these people had not matched as well with the preceding cases.

CASE NO. 9 - A Young Man with Physical Limitations

George B. was one of the few people we talked to who had major physical limitations. He was unable to do heavy work, While he could get around anywhere he had to go, it was taxing to be on his feet for too long. He was able to do light work, though, and since he had left high school three years ago, he had been steadily employed in clerical jobs, until the last four months. Because it was easier for him, he was looking for work mainly by writing letters (2 or 3 a day) rather than knocking on doors; as almost all of the other people we talked to did.

Aside from his physical limitations, he had one other problem in finding work. He had completed just ten years of schooling, and the trades training he had taken after completing elementary school was in a field in which, because of his disabilities, he could no longer hope to work. The combination of

low physical capacity with no usable training had left him feeling quite uncertain about his ability to find work.

His physical limitations had also made it difficult for him to have an active social life. He belonged to no organizations, had friends in less than once a month, and went out with friends less than once a month. Part of the cause for this, though, was the limited amount of money he had available from welfare. George found a job just before our second interview, paying \$80 a week, and began going out with people about once a week and having people in about once a week. Other people we talked to had more active social lives but this was all he wanted. His mother remarked to our interviewer, "George just doesn't bother with people."

He got his job because his father heard about an opening with the company he worked for and recommended George for it. It meant shift work, but was not physically demanding and the working conditions were good, so he was happy to take it.

Once he had a job, he moved out of his parents' home into an apartment, which he shared with one of the other people who worked with the same firm. He had liked living at home, but was in his early twenties and felt it was time he got out on his own. His mother had had to look after several children, and he said she deserved to have her responsibilities reduced.

When we asked him what he expected life would be like for him in five years, he said that he did not know; he had never thought about it. He said that he wanted to stay single for a while and he would like to get a better job with more pay. Maybe he would take some kind of business course. But that was as much as he had thought about the future. In any case, once he had a job, he said that things were okay for him, or at least "they could be worse; I'm basically satisfied".

The preceding four cases taken together were similar to over two-thirds of the other longer-term cases. Adding further illustrations would increase this proportion only slightly. So the five cases we have presented will represent the longer-term cases about as well as they can be represented.

The fact that we could represent only a bit more than two-thirds of our samples in this way underscores the diversity of the population that we have mentioned before. The heterogeneity of the population will, of course, have important implications for social policy. If we want to help people get off welfare more quickly, or to make any other type of policy change, we must contend with the fact that the group is very diverse. We will return to this theme in Chapters 5 and 7, where we will be discussing job seeking and how to get people into jobs more quickly. But before doing so, we should look in more detail at the kinds of answers people gave to our questions about their backgrounds and views of life. These will be discussed in the following chapter.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 4 - BACKGROUNDS, WAYS OF LIVING, VIEWS OF LIFE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Personal Background	4-1
- General Characteristics	4-1
- Mobility	4-3
- Socio-economic Status	4-6
- Places of Residence	4-14
- Previous Employment	4-17
 The Current Situation	 4-23
- Feelings About Being on Welfare	4-23
- Attitudes of Parents and Friends	4-29
- Life Satisfaction	4-32
- Social Contacts	4-35
- A Counter-culture?	4-37
Drug Use	4-39
Marriage	4-43
 Views Of The Future	 4-46
- Planning Ahead	4-48
- The Next Six Months	4-51
- Hopes for the Future	4-52
 Looking For Work	 4-55
- Job Seeking Effort	4-56
- Type of Firms Contacted	4-61
- Acceptable and Unacceptable Jobs	4-63
 Summary of Findings	 4-66
- Some Generalizations	4-66
- Some Common Responses	4-67
- Comparisons Among Groups	4-69

CHAPTER 4

BACKGROUNDS, WAYS OF LIVING, AND VIEWS OF LIFE

In this chapter, we will present our findings on the backgrounds, ways of living and views of life of the people we talked to. Our findings will be discussed under four main headings:

- 1) Personal Background
- 2) The Current Situation
- 3) Ideas About the Future
- 4) Looking for Work

The chapter concludes with a summary of the more important findings.

On each question, we will present data on both the short-term cases and the longer-term cases. As explained in Chapter 2, the three sub-groups among the longer-term cases have been weighted; so the figures in this chapter reflect what we would have found if we had talked to the same proportion of the cases in each sub-group.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND

General Characteristics

As was noted in Chapters 1 and 2, we interviewed people in the age range 16 to 25. We knew from Welfare Department data what the age breakdowns for the groups being studied were. Our samples matched them quite closely.

Table 4-1 shows the age breakdown of our samples.

It will be seen that the longer-term cases are slightly older. Among the short-term cases, there was a group of sixteen and seventeen year olds who had just dropped out of school, and come straight onto welfare. Without them, the short-term and longer-term cases would look very much the same, with a mean age of just over twenty.

TABLE 4-1

Age Distribution of January Cases and Longer-Term Cases,
in Percentages

<u>Age</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
16	8	2
17	13	13
18	23	22
19	16	10
20	10	6
21	8	15
22	8	7
23	8	12
24-25	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	101* (n=90)	99* (n=122)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

We also knew beforehand the number of males and females in the groups to be studied. Among newcomers to the rolls, about sixty per cent were male and about forty per cent female; the same was true of our sample.

Among the longer-term cases, only about fifteen per cent were female. One feature of Ontario's welfare program may explain why the longer-term cases were less likely to be female than the short-term cases. If they were single mothers, they would be transferred to the provincially run Family Benefits Program.* Accordingly, they were less likely

*By law, this may take place after three months of municipal assistance. In practice, it tends to take longer.

to receive welfare from the City of Hamilton over an extended period than the males.

As we explained in Chapter 2, our sample of longer-term cases contains a higher proportion of females than the population from which it was drawn. The figures in the tables that follow have been adjusted to allow for this. But it rarely makes much difference. On the vast majority of questions, the males and females gave very much the same answers.

Mobility

One respect in which the sexes did differ was in geographic mobility. More of the males than females had grown up outside Wentworth County. But among both sexes, most had grown up locally. Table 4-2 shows the situation.

TABLE 4-2

Places Where Respondents Grew Up, by Length of Time on Welfare, in Percentages

<u>Places</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-term Cases</u>
Hamilton & Wentworth County	58	70
Elsewhere in Ontario	18	14
In the Maritimes	9	5
In Quebec	3	0
Elsewhere in Canada	3	3
In Europe	6	8
Elsewhere	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	100 (n=90)	100 (n=122)

Among the short-term cases, about one-quarter grew up outside of Ontario. Just under one-fifth grew up in Ontario, but not in Hamilton-Wentworth. The rest, fifty-eight per cent, were raised in Hamilton-Wentworth. Among the longer-term cases, seventy per cent grew up locally. As Table 4-3 shows, twenty per cent of the newcomers to the rolls had been in Hamilton less than six months. Only three per cent of the longer-term cases had come here so recently. If we take out these recent newcomers to the City, there is little difference in the places where the short-term and the longer-term cases grew up.

TABLE 4-3

Length of Time in Hamilton, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Length of Time</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Up to one month	9	0
Over one month to six months	11	3
Over six months to two years	12	10
Over two years to five years	7	12
Over five years to ten years	8	8
Over ten years	<u>53</u>	<u>68</u>
Total	100 (n=90)	101* (n=122)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Most of the people who had come here in the last one or two years had come by themselves. Their parents had remained in some other

centre. The major reason for coming was to look for work. About half the people who had moved here on their own said this was why they had come.* This may be seen in Table 4-4. The other reasons given were mainly social. Some had friends in Hamilton. Others thought the chances to meet people of the opposite sex were greater.

Among the longer-term cases, those who had come here looking for work had usually found it. But, then, for one reason or another, unemployment had followed. Among the short-term cases, about one in ten had arrived in the City with little or no money. These people were getting welfare to tide them over until they found work.

TABLE 4-4

Reasons for Coming to Hamilton, for January Cases and
Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
To look for work	55	45
Friends here	26	33
More girls (guys) here than where I came from	26	13
Other	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	120* (n=40)	102* (n=38)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses. The responses shown are from those who came here independently, i.e. without their families, or who would have come here for another reason if their families had not come.

*The Canadian Council on Social Development study of 300 young people on welfare in six cities yielded a figure of 45% for the answer "hoped to find a job or had found a job". See Canadian Council on Social Development, A Right to Opportunity, Ottawa, 1972, p. 162.

Socio-economic Status

Most of the people we talked to had come from families which had never received public assistance. There was a substantial minority, though, whose parents had, at one time or another, been on welfare. Table 4-5 shows our findings on this point.

TABLE 4-5

Parents' Reliance on Public Assistance, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Parents' Reliance on Public Assistance</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Never received it	66	60
Did not receive it during child's last 5 years at home	6	14
Received it during child's last five years at home		
- for less than 1 yr.	9	7
- for 1 to 2 yrs.	0	3
- for more than 2 yrs.	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>
Total	99* (n=90)	99* (n=117)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

It will be seen that three-fifths of the families had never been on welfare.* Less than thirty per cent had received it during the

*This compares with a figure of seventy per cent in the Canadian Council on Social Development study of 300 young people on welfare in six cities. See Canadian Council on Social Development, A Right to Opportunity, Ottawa, 1972, p.90.

respondent's last five years at home.

On the other hand, about one-sixth of the people we talked to came from families which had been on welfare for more than two of their last five years at home. Almost all of these were families where the head had been judged to be, at that time, unemployable; they had been getting support through the provincial Family Benefits program. (Many of these families were mother-led.) Only about three per cent of the families in Ontario receive Family Benefits; so, while most of the people we talked to had not grown up in families on welfare, an unusual proportion had.

To get a fuller picture of the socio-economic status of the families from which our respondents had come, we should also look at their fathers' occupations. These will be shown in Table 4-7. But first, we must explain what the occupational groups referred to in the table are. Bernard Blishen, working with census data from 1961, has given a score to each of three hundred twenty types of work. The score for any type of work is based on the average incomes and education of the people in it.* We have broken the list into seven groups. Each group contains forty-five to forty-seven occupations. To provide an idea of the kind of jobs in each category, we have listed some of them in Table 4-6.

It will be seen from Table 4-7 that more than half of the fathers had been in one of the two lowest groups. Less than ten per cent were in the upper two groups, where the professional and semi-professional occupations are found.

In short, the people we talked to were more likely than average to have come from families where the head was unemployable. They were also quite likely to have come from families where the father's occupational status was quite low.

*The rationale for the scores and the listing of occupations may be found in B.R. Blishen's "A Socio-economic Index for Occupations in Canada", Canadian Review of Anthropology and Sociology, Volume 4, 1967, pages 41-55.

TABLE 4-6Examples of the Occupations Placed in the Seven Socio-Economic Categories Used in Analysis of Study Data

<u>Category</u>	<u>Examples of the Occupations in the Category</u>
1	engineers, pharmacists, chartered accountants
2	security salesmen and brokers, clergymen, funeral directors
3	telephone linemen and repairmen, compositors and typesetters, nurses
4	telegraph operators, bookbinders, cranemen, hoistmen and derrickmen
5	sheet metal workers, nursing aides, bus drivers
6	postmen, taxi-drivers, bakers
7	newsvendors, janitors, elevator operators

* * * * *

TABLE 4-7Occupational Status of Fathers, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Father's Occupation by Blishen Scale</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
1	4	2
2	5	7
3	12	7
4	15	21
5	13	6
6	26	34
7	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>
Total	100 (n=76)**	99* (n=99)**

* Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

**The numbers in this table are lower than usual, primarily because of mother-led families and families in which the father was unemployable.

Many studies have shown that children from families of low socio-economic status are not likely to go as far in school as others. Within our sample, among both the short-term and the longer-term cases, the schooling obtained tended to rise with the score for the father's occupation.*

It might also be expected that in a group coming largely from families of low socio-economic status, the average level of schooling would be quite low. This was the case. The levels of schooling received by our respondents will be seen in Table 4-8.

TABLE 4-8

Formal Education Completed, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Level of Education</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
0-4 years	1	4
5 years or more, but elementary incomplete	9	10
Elementary complete	10	15
Some secondary, but Grade 10 not completed	21	28
Grade 10, but secondary incomplete	38	29
Secondary complete	16	9
University training	2	2
Post-secondary professional or technical training (non-university)	3	3
Total	100 (n=90)	100 (n=122)

*The trend was significant at the .05 level for the short-term cases, but did not quite reach this level among the longer-term cases.

Among the January cases, twenty per cent had gone no farther than elementary school. Among the longer-term cases, thirty per cent had gone no farther. Among the out-of-school population, aged 15-24, in the Hamilton Metropolitan Area, the 1971 Census showed that only thirteen per cent had not completed at least one year of high school. The Census also showed that eight per cent of the out-of-school population had some university training.* Among our samples, only two per cent had university training.

The longer-term cases show lower levels of schooling. Thirty per cent had not gone to high school. Another twenty-eight per cent had not completed Grade 10. Only fourteen per cent had completed high school. The short-term cases had gone farther. Close to one-quarter had finished high school. Only twenty per cent had gone no farther than elementary school.**

As we will demonstrate in Chapter 6, level of schooling is an important factor in how quickly people find work. In view of this, it should not be surprising that the longer-term cases have less schooling than the short-term cases.

A low level of schooling was particularly common among the younger people in the sample. Table 4-8a shows that levels of education tend to rise with age, among both the short-term and the longer-term cases. More than two-thirds of the sixteen and seventeen year olds in each group had not finished Grade 10. Among those twenty years of age, or more, sixty-four per cent of the longer-term cases and seventy-four per cent of the short-term cases had completed at least Grade 10. So it is just the people who are newest on the labour market, with the least experience to sell, who also have the least training.

* These figures are calculated from data in Bulletin 1.5-6 of the 1971 Census, Table 6.

**These levels are similar to those found by the Canadian Council on Social Development among 300 young people on welfare in six cities. See Canadian Council on Social Development, op. cit., p. 80.

TABLE 4-8a

Formal Education Completed, by Age, for January Cases
and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Formal Education</u>	<u>January Cases</u>				
	<u>16,17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>Age</u> <u>19,20</u>	<u>21-25</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary completed or less	42	14	26	4	20
Some secondary, Grade 10 not completed	26	19	17	22	21
Grade 10, but secondary not completed	26	48	26	48	38
Secondary completed, or more	5	19	30	26	21
Total	99* (n=19)	100 (n=21)	99* (n=23)	100 (n=27)	100 (n=90)

<u>Formal Education</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>				
	<u>16,17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>Age</u> <u>19,20</u>	<u>21-25</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary completed or less	27	25	37	19	31
Some secondary, Grade 10 not completed	41	39	37	17	26
Grade 10, but secondary not completed	32	29	16	36	29
Secondary completed, or more	0	7	11	28	14
Total	100 (n=22)	100 (n=28)	101* (n=19)	100 (n=53)	100 (n=122)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Because of the problems a limited education may cause, our schools work hard to retain students. In view of this, it is important to know why people leave school. This question was asked only on the second interview, so we have answers from only three-fifths of our total sample. But the answers are of interest in any case. They are shown in Table 4-9.

TABLE 4-9

Responses to the Question, "Why Did You Stop Your Schooling Where You Did?", for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Bored, couldn't hack it	33*	39
Didn't get along with staff	15	10
Pregnant	5	4
Had to go to work (economic reasons)	15	4
Wanted to get out and work	13	12
Course over, felt no need to go farther	18	16
Couldn't advance any farther	4	10
Other	<u>7</u>	<u>20</u>
Total	110** (n=55)	115** (n=68)

* It was pointed out in Chapter 2 that our January sample was low on people who had been convicted in Magistrate's Court in the last year. If those we missed had been interviewed, and if they had gone off the rolls at the same rate, and if they had given the same pattern of answers as those we interviewed, the figure for those answering "bored, couldn't hack it" would have risen by about three per cent.

**Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

Just under half say that they left school because they were bored, they could not hack it, or they did not get along with the staff.* The figure rises to two-thirds among those who had not finished Grade 10.** Only around thirty per cent left because they had finished the course they wanted to take, or because they wanted to get out of school and work. So, for many people, leaving school was a matter of getting away from something, rather than a positive step into the world. There is nothing in our data to explain why people felt this way about school.*** But, clearly, if we want people to receive as much training as they can profit by, this attitude must be taken into account.

Another aspect of leaving school that is worth noting is the degree to which parents encourage their children to stay. Table 4-10 shows our data on this point.

Perhaps the important thing to notice is that more than two-thirds of the people we talked to said they had received no encouragement or only slight encouragement.

In the case of the people who had left school because they had finished the only courses for which they were eligible, this would make sense. Then, too, parents of children who had finished high school offered less encouragement for their children to go further than parents whose children had not finished high school. But most of those who had not completed high school, and who were eligible to go farther said that their parents had offered no encouragement or only slight encouragement.

* Among the short-term cases, there was a very clear sex difference. Forty-one per cent of the males but only nineteen per cent of the females said they were bored or couldn't hack it. Thirty-eight per cent of the females but only six per cent of the males said they had completed the course they were in and were satisfied to stop there. This difference between the sexes can partly be explained by the different numbers who had completed high school. There was a similar difference but not nearly so pronounced among the longer-term cases.

** As noted in Chapter 2, people with more education tended to leave the rolls faster. If this had not been the case, the proportion who gave this type of answer would presumably have risen, but, with the number of cases involved, it is difficult to estimate how much it might have risen.

***It is clear, though, that our respondents were not "just a bunch of complainers". Those who left school because of dislike for it were as likely as others to feel content with their lives in general, and to have enjoyed things in their last job.

TABLE 4-10

Degree of Parental Encouragement to Continue in School at Time of School Leaving, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Degree of Encouragement</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
No encouragement	51	54
Slight encouragement	17	22
Rather strong encouragement	17	15
Strong encouragement	15	9
—	—	—
Total	100 (n=53)	100 (n=65)

It is worth noting, though, that parental encouragement was most common among cases where our respondent had left school because he was bored, could not hack it, or did not get along with the teachers. More than two-fifths of those who left for these reasons against about one-seventh of those who left for other reasons only, had received rather strong or strong encouragement.

Places of Residence

Having left school, most of our respondents also left home. But a large minority did not. More than half of those who had grown up in Hamilton-Wentworth stayed at home. The others had left for various reasons. Table 4-11 spells out these reasons.

TABLE 4-11

Reasons for Leaving Home, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Reason for Leaving</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Not applicable - still living at home	29	41
Strained Relationships	40	37
Pregnancy	3	1
Drugs	2	2
Wanted more freedom of action	6	5
Wanted to live with someone else	6	2
Moved for employment or education	25	3
Family finances	2	4
Don't know	0	4
Other	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	123* (n=73)	107* (n=122)

*Percentages exceed 100 because of multiple responses.

More than half of those who had left home gave "strained relations" as one of the reasons.* The only other common answer was "moved for employment or education". This was given by twenty-five per cent of the short-term cases who, as we noted earlier, were likely to have come to Hamilton looking for work.

In some cases of strained relations, we got some clues as to what was going on. Pregnancy, drugs, and the desire to live with someone

*The Canadian Council on Social Development study reported similar findings. See Canadian Council on Social Development, op. cit., p. 96.

of the opposite sex, when mentioned, were almost always mentioned by someone who had also spoken of strained relations. More often, though, it simply appeared that the young person found something about living with his parents irritating or frustrating and preferred to get out on his own.

Having left home, many people moved from one address to another quite rapidly. This is shown in Table 4-12. Among those who were not living at home, almost half had had three or more addresses in the past two years.

Unfortunately, this level of movement makes it difficult to locate people. It may be that some of the people we could not locate for an interview had simply moved too quickly for us to keep up with them. If so, perhaps the actual rate of change is even higher than it appears.

TABLE 4-12

Number of Residences (in Hamilton and District) in the Preceding Two Years, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Number of Residences</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
one	24	30
two	30	24
three	26	13
four	7	16
five or more	<u>13</u>	<u>18</u>
Total	100 (n=54)**	101.* (n=38)**

* Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

**Those living at home are not included among the cases on which the table is based.

Previous Employment

Many of the people we talked to had also changed jobs very rapidly. Table 4-13 shows the number of jobs people had held in the preceding two years.

TABLE 4-13

Number of Full-time Jobs Held in the Preceding Two Years,
for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Number of Jobs</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
None	15	31
One	31	20
Two	21	16
Three	21	15
Four	7	8
Five or more	<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	100 (n=86)	99* (n=120)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Thirty-one per cent of the longer-term cases and fifteen per cent of the newcomers to the rolls had not held a full-time job in the last two years. But even though many had not held jobs at all, around thirty per cent of both the longer-term cases and the short-term cases had held three or more full-time jobs.

High job turnover, of course, is common among people with few skills. Some idea of the things that happen to people in this situation

may be gleaned from Table 4-14. This table gives the reasons why people left their most recent jobs.

TABLE 4-14

Reasons for Leaving Most Recent Full-time Job, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Reasons for Leaving</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Laid off	32	28
Fired	9	11
Job eliminated	9	13
Short-term job	12	10
Wanted to look for another job	9	10
Pay wasn't worth it	4	7
Wanted to move to another centre	10	3
Other	<u>24</u>	<u>23</u>
Total	109* (n=78)	105* (n=90)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses

Perhaps the most striking thing revealed by the table is the insecurity of the jobs our respondents have held. For more than one-fifth, the last job held had been a short-term job or it had been eliminated. Another three-tenths reported that they had been laid off.

Another group, thirteen per cent of the short-term cases and seventeen per cent of the longer-term cases, said they had quit their last job. Some said it was because the job had not been worth doing for

the pay. Others said they just wanted to look for another. Perhaps they left because of poor working conditions. Or perhaps it was a matter of one person's lack of tolerance for something that to other people would seem all right. But we cannot tell from our data.

It is clear, though, that many people had not had the kinds of jobs that are widely held to be desirable. Table 4-15 shows the most recent jobs people had held, in Census categories.*

TABLE 4-15

Most Recent Full-time Jobs Held, in Census Categories,
by Sex, in Percentages

<u>Type of Job</u>	<u>January Cases</u>		<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Professional & Technical	2	3	1	7
Clerical & Sales	18	37	24	31
Service & Recreation	9	30	11	34
Transport & Communication	2	--	6	--
Craftsmen, Production Process & Related Workers	34	7	21	10
Labourers	32	20	34	17
Occupations in Primary Industry (farming, mining)	2	3	3	--
Total	99* (n=44)	100 (n=30)	100 (n=61)	99* (n=29)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

*Readers familiar with Census data will recognize the categories as those used for reporting on data from the Census of 1961.

It will be seen that there are four dominant categories:

- 1) clerical and sales;
- 2) service and recreation (most of the people in this category had been in personal service jobs);
- 3) craftsmen, production process and related workers (this ordinarily meant factory work of some kind);
- 4) labourers.

Almost one-third of the males and almost one-fifth of the females had been classed as labourers. (It should be noted that this group includes unskilled jobs for which no great physical strength is required.)

It is also worth noting that the pay people had been getting was not very high. Table 4-16 shows this.

The median weekly wage for the males in both the short-term and the longer-term cases had been around \$80. For the short-term females, it had been around \$65. Among the longer-term females, it had been only around \$55.* A fair number managed to earn over \$100 a week. About thirty per cent of the January cases had done so, and about twenty per cent of the longer-term cases. On the other hand, ten per cent of the short-term cases and twenty per cent of the longer-term cases had earned less than \$50 a week. The percentages at this level, as may be seen from the table, were much higher for females than for males.**

The jobs people had held were varied. So were the wage levels. So it might be expected that some people would have been quite unhappy with their work, whereas others would have been quite satisfied.

* It should be noted that some of the income levels reported were possible under minimum wage legislation only because we have included as full-time any job involving more than twenty hours of work a week.

**Another difference among groups may be worth noting. For some reason, among the cases who came on the rolls in January, those whose parents had been on public assistance averaged about \$30 a week less than those whose parents had not. This gap did not appear among the longer-term cases. We do not know why this occurred.

TABLE 4-16

Weekly Wages Received in Most Recent Full-time Job, by Sex, in Percentages

<u>Wages Received</u>	<u>January Cases</u>		<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Under \$40.00	--	16	5	11
\$40.00-\$49.99	2	10	6	21
\$50.00-\$59.99	17	16	20	25
\$60.00-\$74.99	13	32	17	21
\$75.00-\$89.99	28	16	32	14
\$90.00-\$109.00	15	3	11	4
\$110.00-\$129.99	11	6	5	--
\$130.00-\$149.99	9	--	2	--
\$150.00 or more	4	--	1	4
Total	99* (n=46)	99* (n=31)	99* (n=62)	100 (n=28)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

We asked people what they liked and disliked about their most recent jobs. Table 4-17 and Table 4-18 present the answers.

Between one-fifth and one-quarter said that there had been nothing that they had liked about their most recent job. Most people, though, were more positive. About one-quarter said they enjoyed the work. About one-third of the short-term cases and one-seventh of the longer-term cases said they liked the people at work. About one-tenth in each group said they liked the working conditions, or they liked the sense of being productive.

TABLE 4-17

Responses to the Question, "What Did You Like About It (Your Last Full-time Job)?", for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Nothing	21	24
Friends at work	33	15
Income was good	23	16
Working conditions good	13	12
Enjoyed the work	22	27
Sense of productivity	10	10
Other	<u>10</u>	<u>21</u>
Total	132* (n=78)	125* (n=90)

* * * * *

TABLE 4-18

Responses to the Question, "What Did you Dislike About It (Your Last Full-time Job)?", for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Nothing	31	25
The boss	15	9
Others at work	12	10
Pay	9	19
Working conditions	13	7
Disliked the work	11	34
Working hours	15	9
Other	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	121* (n=78)	118* (n=90)

*Percentages do not total to 100 because of multiple responses.

Among the January cases, whether people had something good to say about their last job depended very much on their education. Ninety-five per cent of those who had finished high school liked something about it. Only sixty-four per cent of those who had not gone beyond elementary school had something good to say about it. But no appreciable trend appeared among the longer-term cases. Why the results were different for the two groups is not clear.

Answers to the question on what people had disliked about their most recent jobs were highly varied. A substantial number, thirty-one per cent of the January cases and twenty-five per cent of the longer-term cases had nothing to complain about. Between nine and nineteen per cent of each group complained about the boss, other people at work, the pay, the working conditions, or the working hours. Only one complaint stood out above the others. Thirty-four per cent of the longer-term cases said that they had disliked something about the work itself. Since the kinds of jobs they had held did not seem to differ greatly from the kinds the short-term cases had held, it is unclear why this complaint should stand out.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

Feelings About Being On Welfare

Our respondents had quite different feelings about the jobs they had had. They also had quite different feelings about being on welfare. Most did not like it, for financial reasons, as well as others. First, let us look at the financial reasons. Table 4-19 shows the answers to a question about things that people could not do because of their income level.

Just under three-tenths of both samples said there was nothing essential or very important they could not do. Most of these people were living at home, so they had all the conveniences they were used to. They had no problems finding enough money for rent or for food because their parents simply charged them the welfare allotment.

TABLE 4-19

Responses to the Question, "Is There Anything Essential Or Very Important You Can't Do Because of Your Income Level?", for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
No	29	29
Yes, Not enough money for:		
- housing	10	2
- clothing	49	53
- food	10	10
- entertainment	44	38
- paying debts	11	6
- dating	7	7
- other	<u>22</u>	<u>16</u>
Total	182* (n=90)	161* (n=121)

*Percentages do not total to 100 because of multiple responses.

The seven-tenths who were not satisfied gave, on the average, more than two responses. Two-thirds of those who were not satisfied said they could not buy the clothing they felt they needed. Fourteen per cent of them said they could not eat properly. Another fourteen per cent of the short-term cases who said they had not enough money (but only two per cent of the longer-term cases) said they could not get adequate housing.*

*In this respect, our sample was experiencing a problem found among other groups on welfare in Hamilton. Rosenblum has emphasized the great difficulties that families receiving Family Benefits who must find rental units on the open market have in finding adequate housing within their welfare allowance. Barbara Rosenblum, Family Benefits Recipients in Hamilton: A Study of Needs and Problems, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Hamilton Regional Office, (1974), pages 30 and 31.

That many people had trouble getting adequate food, clothing and shelter should not be too surprising, since the maximum monthly payment for someone living alone at the time was \$112.* Further, the fact that almost two-thirds of the people we talked to said they had difficulty with at least one of these basic needs strongly suggests that their difficulties cannot be written off as due to poor consuming habits. No doubt some people could be better consumers. But if two-thirds of the group say they cannot meet these basic needs satisfactorily, the straightforward conclusion would seem to be that they simply need more money.

Apart from these basic needs, the most common things that people would like more money for are recreational. About one-half of the people in both samples said they did not have enough money for entertainment, or, more specifically, for dating. Although these are less critical than the basic needs for food, clothing and shelter, they are still very important in the lives of single people in the age range being studied.

Now, in view of the problems people have in getting the things they feel they need, we would expect that most would rather not be on welfare. But, apart from the level of income, would people rather be on or off welfare? The answers to this question are shown in Table 4-20. This question was asked only on the second interview; but even with the reduced sample size, there are some interesting things in the data.

About one-fifth of our cases say that, apart from income, it is better to be on welfare or, at least, that welfare is okay for a while. The other four-fifths cite a variety of reasons, on the average two apiece, for preferring not to be on welfare.** About one-fifth give

* This figure might be increased in some special circumstances, for example, the situation of someone who, for medical reasons, required a special diet.

**Some American studies have suggested that large majorities of people on welfare would prefer to be working. The largest is reported in: Goodwin, L., Do the Poor Want to Work?, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1972. Goodwin reports that mothers, fathers, and sons on welfare have about the desire to work in the absence of need for the income as similar groups who are not on welfare. Another study worth noting is reported in: Levinson, P., "How Employable are AFDC Women", Welfare in Review, Volume 16, July-August, 1970. Levinson reports that 80% of a nation-wide sample said they would like to work if they could find a steady job.

the rather imprecise response that it was worse on welfare. About one-half said that they would like to be working. About one-third of the January cases and one-quarter of the longer-term cases said they were bored and sitting around made them feel lazy. About one-fifth said they wanted to be doing something that made them feel productive. Others said that they wanted to support themselves, or that they felt they were being downgraded by other people because they were on welfare.

TABLE 4-20

Responses to the Question, "If It Weren't For The Difference In Income, How Much Better Or Worse Would You Say It Is To Be On Welfare Than Working?", for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Worse on welfare	22	20
Better on welfare	17	20
Bored sitting around, get lazy	39	30
Have to be productive, active	22	17
Would like to work	44	47
Feel better to support self	9	13
Feel downgraded on welfare	13	13
Welfare okay for a while	4	1
Other	4	--
Total	174* (n=54)	161* (n=83)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

All told, then, most people were unhappy about being on welfare. Of those who were interviewed twice, only two per cent found the income adequate and also felt that, apart from the income, welfare was better. In view of their preference for working, it might be expected that most people would have some dissatisfaction with the welfare system. We asked people what they would like to change. Table 4-21 shows their answers.

TABLE 4-21

Suggestions for Improvements in the Welfare System, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Suggested Improvements</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Don't let people on who don't need it	28	9
Recipients who can should work for their money	8	4
Do more investigation of the recipients	10	9
More money for living expenses	54	34
Staff should treat recipients better	18	30
Procedures should be faster	13	26
Waiting time for cheques should be reduced	8	13
Other	8	11
Total	147* (n=39)	136* (n=46)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

We were surprised that only around seventy per cent of our respondents had any suggestions. Whether this means the others were content or whether they had simply not thought about it, we do not know. But, since only seventy per cent answered the question and since it was asked on the second interview, the sample sizes are rather small. So we should be careful not to try to draw too much from the data.

There are some things, however, that stand out quite clearly. The January cases take a more "hard line" position. They are more likely to say that you should not let people on who do not need it, and that recipients who can should work for their money. Allowing for more than one answer per person, twenty per cent more of the newcomers to the rolls than of the longer-term cases made one of these suggestions. The longer-term cases, on the other hand, were more likely to say that staff should treat recipients better, that procedures should be faster, and that waiting time for cheques should be reduced. Allowing, again, for more than one answer per person, about thirty per cent more of the longer-term cases than of the short-term cases made one of these suggestions.

The suggestion made most often in both groups was that more money should be allowed for living expenses.* This may be understood in the light of the kind of things people said they could not afford, which we have discussed above. Some of the suggestions about the administration of the system are no longer very relevant because of changes that have taken place since the interviews were done. But it appears to be worth considering why the short-term cases took a hard line stand whereas the longer-term cases were likely to suggest changes for the benefit of recipients.

One suggestion might be that the longer you have been on welfare, the more likely you are to have met up with bad apples among the staff or to have run into delays in procedures. Then, too, having been on welfare for a time yourself, you may be less likely to be critical about others who are on welfare. If so, you may be less likely

*This suggestion was made equally often by those who found their incomes adequate and inadequate.

to think it is important to check out recipients closely. Another possibility might be that those who had been on welfare for a short time still identified themselves as taxpayers. Those who had been on longer might have begun to identify themselves as welfare recipients. If so, each group might tend to emphasize changes which would be to its own benefit.*

However this may be, the findings we have just reported have a bearing on the argument that welfare rates must be kept low to maintain the incentive to work. Most people said they would prefer to work for other reasons. Most had complaints about the welfare system. But how well non-economic factors will maintain people's interest in finding work depends on how strong the non-economic motives are. We cannot be very precise about this from any data that are available.

Attitudes of Parents and Friends

We can, however, get some idea of how strongly other people might encourage them to find work. One possibility was that people's families or friends might put pressure on them. So we asked how their parents and friends felt about their being on welfare. Table 4-22 shows their parent's reactions.

It will be seen that there are three major differences between the short-term and the longer-term cases. First of all, many more of the short-term cases could not answer the question. A full one-quarter could not. Sometimes their parents were in other communities and did not know they were on welfare. In other cases, there was too little contact for our respondents to be sure how their parents felt. Among those who did know, more than one-fifth of the short-term cases said their parents were pleased about it. Most of these were people who had

*Another interpretation would be that the longer-term cases would be more likely to be interested in getting a free ride from society. This would seem quite unlikely in view of the fact that job seeking levels, job finding success and expressed attitudes to work were about the same for the two groups.

left school recently and who were living at home. If it had not been for welfare, their parents would have had to support them. There is no corresponding group among the longer-term cases, so only three per cent reported that their parents were pleased. On the other hand, many more of the longer-term cases than of the short-term cases, thirty-seven per cent against only fifteen, said that their parents were disappointed. In view of the time they had been on welfare, this seems understandable.

TABLE 4-22

Parents' Attitudes to Their Children's Being on Welfare,
as Perceived by Our Respondents, for January Cases and
Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Parents' Attitudes</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Indifferent	17	18
Pleased (they don't have to support me)	22	3
Accepting (the right thing to do)	15	9
Resigned (the only thing to do)	25	24
Disappointed	15	37
Other	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	101* (n=60)	100 (n=112)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

In other respects, the two groups reported that their families' views of the situation were quite similar. About one-sixth said that their parents were indifferent, not really caring much one way or the other.

About one-quarter were resigned to it, in the sense that it seemed to be the only choice available. Fifteen per cent of the newcomers to the rolls and nine per cent of the longer-term cases described their parents' reactions as "accepting".

Now it is probably only from parents whose reaction was classed as resigned or disappointed that we would expect any great pressure to find work. There could be none from those who did not know their child was on welfare or from those whose children were not sure how they felt. It would seem quite unlikely from the indifferent, or from those whose major concern was that they would not have to support their children. Nor would those who felt that going on welfare was the right thing to do be likely to press very hard or to offer much encouragement. How much influence the parents in the resigned and disappointed categories would exert, we do not know. But it does, at least, seem that many of our respondents would not be receiving much pressure or much encouragement.

It also appears that little pressure would come from friends. About one-quarter of our respondents said their friends did not know they were on welfare, or that they did not know how their friends felt about it. Table 4-23 shows what the people who felt they knew where their friends stood reported.

More than four-fifths of the short-term cases and just under two-thirds of the longer-term cases reported that their friends were accepting of their status, indifferent to it, or pleased about it. Clearly, then, the majority would not be expected to receive any great pressure from their friends to alter their situation.*

*Just over half had received suggestions from their friends on places to look for work. In the light of our data on friends' attitudes, as seen by the respondents, this would seem to result from a desire to be helpful, rather than an attempt to pressure anyone into looking harder.

TABLE 4-23

Friends' Attitudes to Our Respondents' Being on Welfare,
as Reported by Our Respondents, for January Cases and
Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Friends' Attitudes</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Indifferent	53	32
Pleased for me	6	7
Accepting (the right thing to do)	24	26
Resigned (the only thing to do)	1	6
Disappointed	7	21
Other	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	100 (n=70)	98* (n=90)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Perhaps it would be reasonable to conclude that most people were not happy about being on welfare but were not receiving much pressure from parents, and certainly not from friends, to get a job. This lack of pressure may help to account for the number of people who expressed a basic contentment with their situations.

Life Satisfaction

We asked a series of open-ended questions designed to give us some idea of how satisfied people were with their lives in general. These included: "How satisfied would you say you are with your way of life?"; "Does your life ever seem to be without purpose?"; "What could make your life happier than it is now?". We summed the times people

gave an answer to one of these questions that showed contentment with life. Table 4-24 shows the results.

TABLE 4-24

Responses to Open-Ended Questions Showing Contentment with the Present Situation, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
None	46	46
One	34	31
Two or more	20	23
Total	100 (n=90)	100 (n=122)

Just under half gave no answers that showed contentment. About one-third gave one. About one-fifth gave two or more. Perhaps we should give some examples of the kinds of answers that were coded in this way:

"I like it. I have fun with friends, going to parties, having a good time."

"I am quite satisfied. There could be a lot of improvements but they will come as I grow older."

"I am very satisfied. I have got my freedom. I can do what I want to do when I want to do it."

"I'd say I'm happy. There are things I want but I'm in no hurry to get them, or, at least, I won't be disappointed if I don't get them. I don't know what it would be (that would make me happier). I'm satisfied now. I have my fiancé and that is really all that matters."

Now, when people answer in this way, it would seem that whatever their dislike of being on welfare, it is not something that is burning inside them. As we will see in Chapter 5, answers showing contentment are related to low levels of looking for work. Perhaps we might conclude that, while most people feel there are real drawbacks to being on welfare, at least half do not find that these drawbacks prevent them from being basically content with their lives.

This interpretation is supported by our data on dissatisfaction. The same questions that drew answers showing contentment with life from just over half our respondents also drew answers showing dissatisfaction from about half of the cases. The answers coded this way included the following:

"I don't like it (my way of life). There's no freedom. You have to have money to have freedom."

"It's boring staying in one place all day long washing diapers."

"I don't have any money to give my baby the things she needs. I feel she might be better off with someone else."

"I'm living like a vegetable. I'd like to be self-sufficient."

"You can't plan anything unless you have a job - you have to have income."

The vast majority of answers showing dissatisfaction had to do with the lack of a job or the lack of income. There were some people who gave answers showing both a basic contentment and a substantial dissatisfaction. But ordinarily, people gave one or the other. This is one reason why we have interpreted answers showing contentment as a sign that the person's dislike of being on welfare is not strong enough to interfere with his basic enjoyment of life.

Another aspect of the question of contentment was mentioned in Chapter 1. It has often been said that being on welfare over a long period can lead to major declines in morale. But the January cases and

the longer-term cases were about equally likely to say they were content. We also checked the answers given by the people who were interviewed twice to see whether the additional time on welfare made any difference. About three-fifths of those who were on welfare at both calls scored the same. As many of the rest showed more contentment on the second call as showed less.

Social Contacts

One reason for the contentment with life felt by many people was that they had good friends, with whom they spent much of their time. Table 4-25 shows the extent of their contact with friends.

The vast majority have friends in at least once a week and go out to visit friends at least once a week. Among the January cases, three-quarters have friends in, and more than five-sixths go out visiting, at least this often. The figures for the longer-term cases run about ten per cent lower. At the other extreme, about one-sixth of both groups never have friends in. This usually resulted from living in a boarding house where it was not permitted. But sometimes it resulted from not having any close friends in the Hamilton area.

Although the table does not show it, most of the people who said they had friends in and went out visiting at least once a week, would be with their friends four or five nights a week. Since, as we have seen earlier, our respondents had little to spend on recreation, it would seem natural that much of their free time would be spent in this way. Similarly, if you have a television, it is a cheap form of entertainment. The average person in our samples spent about fifteen hours a week watching television.

TABLE 4-25

Frequency of Having Friends in and Going Out to Visit Friends, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>January Cases</u>		<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>	
	<u>Having Friends In</u>	<u>Going Out Visiting</u>	<u>Having Friends In</u>	<u>Going Out Visiting</u>
Once a week or more	76	86	68	77
Less often, but at least once a month	3	6	4	6
Less often than once a month	3	3	10	7
Never	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	99* (n=88)	100 (n=90)	99* (n=121)	99* (n=121)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Now, of course, friends may want to do things that you cannot afford. But if you are in the same boat, this is not a problem. Almost exactly half of the people we talked to said they had friends on welfare. Among the people they knew who were their own age, but not on welfare, the average income levels were not high. The males' friends averaged about \$95 a week. The females' friends averaged about \$70 a week. The low income levels of their friends was probably a basic reason why they were able to maintain active social lives without much money.

Another leisure activity for which money is not very important is visiting with the family. Although this was not as frequent as visiting with friends, it was also a major theme in the lives of the people

we talked to. Table 4-26 shows the frequency of visits with parents and with brothers and sisters. It should be noted that this question was asked only on the second interview. Then, too, it was not applicable to those who were living at home. So the numbers are small and provide only a rather broad view of family visiting.

It will be seen that the longer-term cases had more frequent contacts. The median frequency of visits with parents would be three to four times a month. More than half said that they saw brothers or sisters more than once a week. Among the January cases, on the other hand, the median frequency of contact with parents was only once a month. About one-half said they saw brothers or sisters once a week or more. The main reason why the January cases had less contact with their families appears to be that more of them had come recently to Hamilton from other centres. If we take out those who had been here less than six months, more than half the difference between the two groups disappears.

Now, on the average, the people we talked to would have had friends in about twice a week, visited with friends about as often, and visited with their families about once a week. So it is clear that social contacts were a major part of their lives.

A Counter-Culture?

One of the things that was being said in the media at the time the study was designed was that a "counter-culture" was developing, in which drug use, rejection of work, and rejection of traditional marriage were common. We wanted to know how true this was of our samples.

We have seen that many of the people we talked to had friends on welfare, and that their friends did not seem very upset about their being on welfare. Many, almost half, were content with their situation. Now, if in a group of people many are on welfare, and if other people within the group are quite accepting of those on welfare, it would seem reasonable to think that there might be a rejection of work involved. Yet, on the other hand, the people we talked to usually said that they would have preferred to work.

TABLE 4-26

Frequency of Visits with Parents and Siblings, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Visits</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	
	<u>Visits with Parents</u>	<u>Visits with Siblings</u>
More than once a week	18	37
Just once a week	12	13
2-3 times a month	15	8
Once a month	12	11
Less often	42	26
Never	—	5
Total	99* (n=33)	100 (n=38)

<u>Frequency of Visits</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>	
	<u>Visits with Parents</u>	<u>Visits with Siblings</u>
More than once a week	39	56
Just once a week	11	9
2-3 times a month	7	5
Once a month	12	8
Less often	25	22
Never	—	—
Total	101* (n=42)	100 (n=44)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Then, too, there are other ways of looking at the situation. There are no local figures, but on a national basis, at the time of the study about twenty-two per cent of the males in the age range 17-19 who were not in school were unemployed. This was also the case with fourteen per cent of the females.* Our respondents said that the incomes of the people they knew, who were their own age but who were not on welfare, were on the average just slightly higher than their own incomes in their last jobs.** This would suggest that the jobs their friends held may have been almost as insecure as their own had been. This, in turn, would suggest that in the social milieu in which our respondents moved, the chances of unemployment would be higher than average. If the local unemployment rates for people in the age range we were studying were similar to the national figures, then the rates in the milieu in which our respondents moved should have been still higher.

Now, if this many people are unemployed and if those who are employed are often in insecure jobs, it is hard to see how very much stigma can be attached to unemployment. It would seem, then, that the acceptance of welfare found among the friends of our respondents could result from the nature of their social milieu as easily as from a rejection of work. How true this is cannot be determined from our data. But we can look at some other data related to the presence of a counter-culture. For example, we asked how often people used alcohol, marijuana and stronger drugs. The answers are shown in Table 4-27.

Drug Use

The January cases and the longer-term cases are very similar. About one-sixth of each group never touched alcohol. About two-thirds never used marijuana. About four-fifths never used anything stronger. In the case of marijuana, the percentage who never used the drug was very similar to the percentage of students in Grades 11 and 13 in Toronto, who did not.***

* Department of Manpower and Immigration, The Labour Force, January, 1972, Table 11.

** Compare Table 4-16 and Table 4-26.

*** In 1972 an Addiction Research Foundation survey showed that just over thirty-one per cent of students in these grades had used marijuana in the preceding six months. See Smart, Reginald, et al, Trends in Drug Use Among Metropolitan Toronto High School Students: 1968-74, Toronto, Addiction Research Foundation, 1975, p. 11.

TABLE 4-27

Frequency of Reported Use of Alcohol, Marijuana and Stronger Drugs, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Use</u>	<u>January Cases</u>		
	<u>Alcohol</u>	<u>Marijuana</u>	<u>Stronger Drugs</u>
Frequently	9	7	1
Sometimes	32	9	2
Occasionally	31	10	3
Rarely	11	8	11
Never	<u>17</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>82</u>
Total	100 (n=90)	100 (n=89)	99* (n=89)

<u>Frequency of Use</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>		
	<u>Alcohol</u>	<u>Marijuana</u>	<u>Stronger Drugs</u>
Frequently	10	3	2
Sometimes	19	6	5
Occasionally	31	13	7
Rarely	21	10	5
Never	<u>19</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>80</u>
Total	100 (n=122)	99* (n=122)	99* (n=122)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

This, too, raises questions about the presence of a counter-culture. The level of soft drug use among our respondents seems to be similar to that among others of the same age in the near vicinity. Once again, we could explain this in terms of the social milieu.

The two samples are alike in the number who do not use harder drugs. But fourteen per cent of the longer-term cases said they used them more often than "rarely". Only six per cent of the short-term cases said they did so. Many of the longer-term cases had been heavily into drugs or were still involved with them. In these cases, drug use may be the reason for being on welfare, since it is often difficult for frequent drug users to hold full-time jobs. This may be the reason why people who used stronger drugs more than "rarely" were more common among the longer-term cases.

Another variation in drug use arose among the newcomers to the rolls. In this group, use of marijuana was strongly related to education. Among those who had finished high school, more than half said they used it. Among those who had not gone any farther than elementary school, five out of six never used it. Use of stronger drugs was related to the father's occupational status. The higher the father's status, the more likely the child was to use them.

Now this might suggest that, among our sample, there were a number of dropouts from the middle class who had taken up drugs and who might have only a limited interest in work. In fact, some of the cases do resemble the middle-class dropout stereotype.

This does not mean, of course, that those who come from middle-class families and who have finished high school are likely to be the heaviest users of drugs. If you come from a middle-class background and finish high school, you are less likely than other people to end up on welfare for reasons other than drug use. So if people with this type of middle-class background used drugs to the same extent as others (or perhaps less than others), a higher proportion of those from this group who were on welfare might be expected to be drug users.

While the two samples were very much alike in drug use, there were differences in attitudes to drugs.* These may be seen in Table 4-28.

TABLE 4-28

Responses to the Question, "What Do You Think of Using Drugs?",
for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Strong negative reactions (various)	20	58
Not a good idea	24	40
Miscellaneous negative reactions	30	43
Only okay if under control	6	7
People must decide for themselves	8	2
Don't know about drugs - never tried them	10	3
Depends which ones - soft drugs are okay, strong ones bad	28	15
I like it, it's good	20	4
They can help you learn about yourself	8	--
Total	154* (n=50)	172* (n=65)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

*Perhaps this is because the question of drug use was asked only on the first round of interviews, and the question of what people thought of using drugs was asked on the second. It seems unlikely, though, since the use of drugs was related to finding work to about the same extent among the short-term and longer-term cases.

In all of the categories for negative answers, the longer-term cases gave more replies. The January cases were more likely to say that soft drugs were all right, more likely to say that they liked to use drugs themselves, and more likely to say that using drugs could help you learn about yourself. More than one-quarter of the January cases said that they liked to use drugs, or that they could help you learn about yourself. Only four per cent of the longer-term cases said either of these. Part of the difference between the two groups could result from the tendency, noted above, for those with more education to be more frequent drug users. As we have seen, the January cases tended to have more formal education.

Marriage

Another feature of the counter-culture stereotype, along with drug use and a rejection of work, would be rejection of marriage. As a final test for the presence of a counter-culture, we asked people whether they wanted to get married, and what they thought of living common law. The results of the latter question are shown in Table 4-29.

The January cases and the longer-term cases appear to take very much the same point of view. About three-tenths of each group objected to the idea on principle. But at the other extreme, more than one-half of the January cases and more than three-fifths of the longer-term cases thought it was a good idea. Thirteen per cent of the January cases and ten per cent of the longer-term cases felt that living common law was better than being legally married. Many of these people said that you could get out more easily if it went bad.

As is often the case with issues of morality, some people, while taking one position for themselves, were willing to be tolerant of others who differed. Thus, about a quarter of those who said it was not right, also said that the question was up to those involved. A few also said that they could see it if the people involved could handle it. But most of the one-quarter who said they could see it if the people involved were suited to it were saying that, while it would not work for most people, it might for some.

TABLE 4-29

Responses to the Question, "What Do You Think of Common Law Marriages?", for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Better than legal marriage	13	10
Agree with them, they're good	40	50
Can break up without strings	17	25
They're all right for awhile	9	--
Can see it if people are suited to it	26	27
The question is up to those involved	13	19
Don't like the idea, it's not right	28	30
Children shouldn't be involved	8	3
Other	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	156* (n=53)	169* (n=65)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple responses.

All told, views on this question were quite varied. Certainly, a high proportion thought the idea of living common law was attractive. On the other hand, a clear preference for it over legal marriage was expressed by only about one person in eight.

Another consideration, if we want to see whether there is a counter-culture, is that the people who liked the idea of living common law are not the same ones who liked the idea of using drugs. As we noted above, among the January cases it was those with the highest education who were most liberal in their views on drugs. On the question of common law unions, it was the other way around. Two-thirds of those who had completed less than Grade 10 said they liked the idea. Among those who had completed Grade 10, or more, only one-quarter said this.*

Whether our respondents will translate favourable attitudes into action is unclear. A quite clear majority said they wanted to get married, common law unions not included. The data are shown in Table 4-30.

TABLE 4-30

Interest in Getting Married, for January Cases
and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Degree of Interest</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Would like to marry	73*	58
Undecided	6	16
Do not want to marry	<u>21</u>	<u>27</u>
Total	100 (n=89)	101** (n=122)

* Percentages do not add to 100 because of rounding.

**This figure may be four or five per cent too high, because of an error made by an interviewer on a number of cases.

Among the January cases, those who wanted to marry outnumbered those who did not by more than three to one, with only six per cent

*There was also a negative correlation between favourable attitudes to drugs and favourable attitudes to common law unions.

undecided. Among the longer-term cases, those who wanted to marry outnumbered those who did not by better than two to one, but about one-sixth of the cases were undecided.

As we might expect, since those who were better educated were more likely to reject the idea of living common law, those who were more educated were more likely to want to marry. Table 4-30a shows the trend. Among the longer-term cases, the proportion who want to marry rises regularly from forty-three per cent among those who had not gone beyond elementary school, to eighty-four per cent among those who finished high school. The trend is not so regular among the January cases. Those who had not gone to high school were more likely to want to marry than those who had gone to high school, but had not completed Grade 10. But the percentage rises from fifty-eight among those who had gone to high school, although not to the end of Grade 10, to ninety per cent among those who had finished high school.

Having gone over our evidence on the presence of a counter-culture, we can sum up. We have seen that there was nothing persuasive to suggest that work was widely rejected, and some evidence to the contrary. We have seen that drug use is similar to that for other people, in the same age range, in the near vicinity. We have seen that those who favour drug use are not the same ones who reject marriage. Altogether, it would seem that while many people hold non-traditional ideas on these matters, a case for a widespread counter-culture could not easily be made.

VIEWS OF THE FUTURE

Granted the age of the people we talked to, it might be expected that many would not have any clear thoughts about what they wanted from the future. But on key issues like marriage, as we have seen, they seemed to have ideas. On the other hand, many of our respondents' ideas were not very well thought out. Many, in fact, said that they had not done a lot of thinking about the future at all.

To get some idea of how our respondents saw the future, we asked a series of open-ended questions. Among them, we included:

TABLE 4-30a

Interest in Getting Married, by Education, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

Degree of Interest	January Cases			
	Elementary or less	Some Secondary but not up to Grade 10	Grade 10 but secondary not completed	Secondary completed or more
Would like to marry	67	58	76	90
Undecided	--	11	6	5
Do not want to marry	33	32	18	5
Total	100 (n=18)	101* (n=19)	100 (n=33)	100 (n=19)

Degree of Interest	Longer-Term Cases			
	Elementary or less	Some Secondary but not up to Grade 10	Grade 10 but secondary not completed	Secondary completed or more
Would like to marry	43	58	62	84
Undecided	30	17	16	5
Do not want to marry	27	25	22	11
Total	100 (n=30)	100 (n=36)	100 (n=37)	100 (n=19)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

"How do you expect things will be for you five years from now?"

"A person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. How do you feel about this point of view?"

"The lot of the average man is getting worse not better. How do you feel about this point of view?"

Some other questions also led to comments about the future. But these questions drew most of the responses we received on the subject. The answers were coded in a number of ways.

Planning Ahead

We were particularly looking for two basic approaches - living day by day and planning for the future. Some examples of comments that were coded under these headings should make their meaning clear.

Answers coded "living day by day":

"You don't really know if you are going to die tomorrow; therefore, you should live for today."

"I don't like to make plans. If they fall through, I get disappointed. I don't like to be disappointed."

"I don't want to worry about what is going to happen in the future. I can't change it!"

Answers coded "the future needs planning":

"You've got to think about future security, especially if you plan to have kids."

"It's more rewarding to make plans and take on responsibilities."

"If you don't plan, you are going to have troubles. You can't spend everything today. You have to have something for tomorrow."

"It's another form of vegetation if you are not thinking about tomorrow."

Answers coded in these two ways seemed to imply quite different views of life. Those who favoured living day by day were often fatalists. Sometimes they had seen so many plans go astray that they simply had lost faith in their ability to control their lives. Others felt events were so unpredictable that you could not plan. On the other hand, those who said the future needs planning tended to feel that an individual could have an influence over his fate, that he should do so, and that if he did not try, the result would be trouble of one kind or another.

Sometimes these two points of view were found in the same person. Some would say, in effect, "Yes, I know I should plan ahead, but I don't." Others might say that they knew they had to plan ahead, and they did a certain amount of it, but they also wanted to get as much as they could from life in the present. But more than eighty per cent of the people who gave one of these responses did not give the other. Our basic data are found in Table 4-31.

Among the short-term cases, two-thirds gave responses coded "living day by day". Only about two-fifths gave an indication of planning ahead. Among the longer-term cases, fifty-five per cent gave an answer coded "living day by day" and the same percentage gave an answer coded "the future needs planning". As might have been expected, those who felt the future needed planning were somewhat older than those who did not.

We originally tried to code answers in this way because we expected that those who lived day by day might be less worried about finding work than those who were thinking ahead. As we will see in Chapter 5, the matter was not quite so simple. But at any rate, it is clear that we have identified some quite basic differences in people's views of life.

TABLE 4-31

Views About the Future, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, In Percentages

<u>Frequency of Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Future Needs Planning</u>
	<u>Live Day by Day</u>	
No responses	33	59
One response	56	33
Two or more responses	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	100 (n=90)	100 (n=90)

Longer-Term Cases

<u>Frequency Responses</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>	<u>Future Needs Planning</u>
	<u>Live Day by Day</u>	
No responses	45	45
One response	44	40
Two or more responses	<u>11</u>	<u>16</u>
Total	100 (n=122)	101* (n=122)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

The Next Six Months

We also wanted to know what specific plans people had for themselves. So we asked them what they planned to do over the next six months. Their answers are shown in Table 4-32.

TABLE 4-32

Responses to the Question, "What Do You Plan To Do Over the Next Six Months?", for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Find a job	65*	76*
Get more education	11	10
No real plans	22	14
Travel, save to travel	15	10
Get married	9	6
Remain on welfare	9	2
Other	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	140** (n=55)	120** (n=68)

* This answer, as shown in Chapter 6, was associated with finding work. If the question had been asked on the first round, this answer might have been more common, but, with the numbers involved, it is difficult to estimate how much difference there might have been.

**Percentages do not sum to 100 because of multiple response.

Two-thirds of the January cases and three-quarters of the longer-term cases mentioned finding a job. On the other hand, more than one-quarter of the short-term cases and one-sixth of the longer-term cases said they had no real plans or that they planned to stay on welfare.

Other things mentioned, less frequently, included travelling, getting married, or getting more education. With the exception of those who were getting married, people who gave these responses were usually quite vague about what they were going to do. Then, too, those who said they planned to get a job did not often have specific ideas as to how they were going to get one. They simply meant that this was something they wanted to do and expected they would be able to do. All told then, there were few people who had any very clearly laid out plans.

Hopes For The Future

Another approach to people's hopes for the future is to see what they mention when they are asked open-ended questions about it. Quite a number of open-ended questions drew answers about what people wanted from the future. The main ones were - "What would make your life happier than it is now?", and "How do you expect things will be for you five years from now?". There were three major types of response - desire for employment; desire for material success or security, and desire for positive human relations, ordinarily marriage. Some examples of answers placed in these categories should make their meaning clear.

Answers coded "desire for employment":

Examples given here were all received in response to the question "What would make your life happier than it is now?".

"Just getting a job on the straight and narrow."

"To work in a hospital with kids."

"To find a good job. You're limited without one in everything you do. If I get a steady job, it will be great."

Answers coded "desire for material success or security":

"I just want enough money to be able to have a place to stay, security and to have fun."

"To be able to buy things and to call them my own."

"I would like to have a lot more money. Then I wouldn't have to worry."

"Security, money saved up."

Answers coded "desire for positive human relations":

"There are so many things I'm looking forward to - marriage, a family, etc."

"I want to find the right guy to marry me and accept me, and to have a baby."

"I'll save to get married. I want children."

The frequency of these types of answer may be seen in Table 4-33. Desire for employment was the most common of the three. Over two-thirds of both samples mentioned their desire for a job at least once. Among the January cases, this was related to age. Just over half of the sixteen and seventeen year olds mentioned it. More than three-quarters of those over twenty mentioned it. Desire for material success or security came next. Five-eighths of the January cases and just under one-half of the longer-term cases mentioned this. Among the January cases, those from families where the father had a relatively high occupational status were more likely to mention it.

Now in view of the fact that most people said that they did not have enough money from welfare, that they would prefer to work, and that one of the things they were going to do over the next six months was to get a job, it should not be too surprising that employment and a better material situation would be high on their list of hopes for the future.

A desire for positive human relations, ordinarily marriage, came next. About half the short-term cases and one-third the longer-term cases mentioned this. This seems consistent with the expressed desire of most of our respondents to marry.

TABLE 4-33

Responses to Open-Ended Questions Showing Desire for Employment, Material Success, and Positive Human Relations in the Future, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>January Cases</u>			
<u>Frequency of Response</u>	<u>Desire for Employment</u>	<u>Desire for Material Success</u>	<u>Desire for Positive Human Relations</u>
No responses	31	37	51
One response	29	36	33
Two or more responses	40	28	16
Total	100 (n=90)	101* (n=90)	100 (n=90)

<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>			
<u>Frequency of Response</u>	<u>Desire for Employment</u>	<u>Desire for Material Success</u>	<u>Desire for Positive Human Relations</u>
No responses	30	56	68
One response	32	24	19
Two or more responses	38	20	13
Total	100 (n=122)	100 (n=122)	100 (n=122)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

LOOKING FOR WORK

To be more specific about their desire for work, we asked people whether they were looking for any particular kind of work. Exactly one-half of each sample said yes. Among those who had something specific in mind, the type of work varied widely. The overall pattern of answers was quite similar to the pattern for jobs that people had held most recently.

The same proportions of the two samples had a specific type of work in mind. The kinds of work they were looking for were also very much alike. But there were real differences in their views of their prospects for getting work. About one-third of each group would not hazard a guess at their chances. The answers given by those who felt they had an idea of how likely they were to get the kind of work they would prefer are shown in Table 4-34.

TABLE 4-34

Responses to the Question, "How Would You Rate Your Chances of Getting the Kind of Work You Would Prefer?", (Over the Next Three Months) for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Chances</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Excellent	5	0
Very good	12	2
Good	23	19
Fair	37	28
Poor	14	35
Very poor	<u>9</u>	<u>16</u>
Total	100 (n=65)*	100 (n=73)*

*People who did not say they were seeking a specific type of work could answer this question, since "the kind of work you would prefer" was interpreted more broadly than "any particular kind of work".

More than one-half of the longer-term cases rated their chances as poor or very poor. Less than one-quarter of the January cases felt the odds were that bad. At the other end of the scale, two-fifths of the January cases thought their chances were good or better. Barely half that proportion of the longer-term cases rated their chances as good or better.

It is not at all clear why there should be such a difference between the short-term and longer-term cases. There are some obvious possibilities, but they do not match well with the data. For example, it might be thought that the reason for the difference is just that the longer-term cases had been on welfare longer because of lower job qualifications. If so, then it might simply be realism on their part to be less hopeful about getting the kind of work they wanted. But as it turns out, there is no correlation between schooling or the social status score for the most recent job and optimism about finding work. Another possibility might be that those who have been on longer have simply become discouraged by repeated failure. But there is no correlation between frequency of looking for work in the past two weeks or between the number of firms contacted in the last three months and optimism about finding work. It might also be suggested that being on welfare over a period of time produces pessimism. This may be the case but, if so, there was no sign of it over the period between the first and second interviews. While individuals changed, there was no overall trend either up or down. So if pessimism increases over a period on welfare, it does not appear to do so very quickly. Altogether then, we will simply have to call this an unresolved question.

Job Seeking Effort

We have mentioned some data on frequency of job seeking and on the number of firms contacted. Perhaps this is the best time to look at these questions. Table 4-35 shows how often people went out to look for work in the two weeks before the first interview.* It should be noted

*The average levels were somewhat lower on the second interview. This resulted from the fact that those who had been looking most frequently more often found jobs before the second interview than those who had been looking less frequently.

that we have not included anyone who had been declared unemployable, who was sick for a part of the two week period, or had been on welfare less than ten days when we called on him. It should also be explained that we have measured frequency of going out in half days. Someone who went out each morning and afternoon for five days would have a score of ten.

TABLE 4-35

Frequency of Going Out to Look for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
Not at all	27	25
Once or twice	23	22
Three or four times	16	15
Five to nine times	17	18
Ten or more times	17	20
Total	100 (n=82)	100 (n=104)

About one-quarter of both samples had not gone out to look for work in the preceding two weeks. More than one-fifth had gone out only once or twice. At the other end of the scale, one-fifth to one-sixth had gone out ten times or more.

There are two related questions to be asked about this. First, why should there be such a broad range in job seeking effort, when the vast majority of people say they want work? Second, why have so many not looked at all? These questions will be the focus of attention in

Chapter 5. But it may be worthwhile at this point to look at some parallels between our findings and the findings of some other studies.

As we noted in Chapter 1, there are few published studies of job seeking. The few studies there are present findings which are, in some important ways, rather like our own. Shepherd and Belitsky report that, among workers under thirty, in their sample of people using the State Unemployment Service in Erie, Pennsylvania in 1962, only thirty-six per cent began their job hunt within the first week of becoming unemployed.* We interviewed most of the January cases about two weeks after they had come on the rolls. At that time, twenty-seven per cent had not been out looking for work and twenty-three per cent had only been out once or twice. This seems roughly consistent with Shepherd and Belitsky's findings. These results are also similar to those reported in the Vancouver study, Why Do Young People Go On Welfare?, Only about half of their respondents went looking for work more than once every two weeks.**

Other studies have reported on quite different populations. For example, Powell and Driscoll have reported on the behaviour of unemployed scientists and engineers.*** They reported that most people went through a series of stages. At first they did no job hunting. After an average of about twenty-five days, their efforts went up to a quite high level. If, after a time, no success was met, job seeking effort would drop off. The authors present no figures on the actual levels of job seeking. But it would seem that, at least during the first period, their respondents' behaviour was similar to that of our newcomers to the rolls.

* This proportion is calculated from a table in H.L. Shepherd and A.H. Belitsky, op.cit., page 138.

** J. Cox, et al, Why do Young People Go On Welfare? B.C. Institute of Technology, Vancouver, 1972, Appendix "B". It should be noted that the population studied included transients. About 40% had been in Vancouver less than one year.

***D.H. Powell and P.F. Driscoll, "Middle Class Professionals Face Unemployment". Society, Vol. 10, No. 2, January-February, 1973, pp. 18-26.

The broadest group on which data have been published is a sample of 931 people who were contacted in January, 1969, by Canada's Monthly Labour Force Survey, and who had been without work for five weeks or more in 1968. It can be estimated from published data that about one-fifth, after losing one job, did not begin to look for another for two weeks or more.* This is not far below the figure for not looking in the past two weeks in our sample of those who had just come on the welfare rolls. Workers aged 14-19 were "more likely to wait two weeks or more before beginning than older workers, but the difference is certainly not marked.**

It is quite unfortunate that so little is known about levels of job seeking among other populations. It would appear, however, that, at least in some circumstances, other kinds of people show low levels of job seeking, particularly towards the beginning of their time of unemployment. Another comparison can be made in terms of the number of firms contacted, since Shepherd and Belitsky have collected this data as well. Our results are shown in Table 4-36.

About one-sixth of the January cases and one-seventh of the longer-term cases have not contacted any firms. At the other extreme, just under one-seventh of the January cases and almost one-quarter of the longer-term cases had contacted twenty or more.

Since the longer-term cases had been on welfare longer, we would expect them to have contacted more firms. This was the case. Less than one-quarter of the longer-term cases had contacted two firms or less, against two-fifths of the January cases. We have already mentioned the difference at the other end of the scale. It might be noted that the difference between the two groups is probably larger than these figures suggest. We have allowed people to go back as far as three months. Over that period, lapses of memory are apt to occur. Since the January cases had not been unemployed nearly as long, their figures were less likely to be affected by this.

* The estimate is based on data presented in the Economic Council of Canada's Eighth Annual Review. Information Canada, 1971, p. 173, Table 8-1.

**op. cit., p.177.

It would seem that our sample was behaving rather like the unemployed blue collar workers in Shepherd and Belitsky's sample. Table 4-36a shows the number of firms contacted by this group over a one month period.

TABLE 4-36

Number of Individual Firms Checked with (Within a Maximum of Three Months), for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>No. of Firms</u>	<u>January Cases</u>	<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>
None	18	14
1 - 2	21	9
3 - 5	20	25
6 - 9	11	12
10 - 19	16	18
20 or more	<u>13</u>	<u>23</u>
Total	99* (n=76)	101* (n=118)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

* * * * *

TABLE 4-36a

Total Number of Companies Checked by Blue-Collar Workers in a One-month Period (From Shepherd and Belitsky's Sample of Users of the State Employment Service in Erie, Pennsylvania, in 1962)

<u>No. of Companies</u>	<u>Percentage of Workers</u>
0 - 5	40
6 - 10	29
11 - 20	20
21 or more	<u>12</u>
Total	101* (n=202)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

It will be seen that in their sample, forty per cent contacted five firms or less over a one-month period. This figure is lower, by about twenty per cent, than the figure for our January cases who, on the average, had been on welfare a little more than two weeks. But their figures are also lower than the figures for our longer-term cases, who had had longer to look. Even allowing for memory lapses, this would seem to suggest that perhaps our longer-term cases had not been looking as hard. At the other end of the scale, twelve per cent of their sample had made more than twenty-one contacts. Thirteen per cent of our short-term cases had made twenty or more in, on the average, just a little over half the time period. Almost twice as many of our longer-term cases had made twenty or more calls. All told, perhaps our short-term group had been looking harder, and our longer-term group not quite so hard. Making some allowance for greater forgetting on the part of our longer-term cases, it would seem that the overall picture is not too different in the two studies.*

Type of Firms Contacted

Although there was not any great difference in how often people went out to look for work, or in the number of firms contacted, that could be attributed to sex, there was a difference in the types of firm contacted. Table 4-37 shows this.

*We cannot make a precise comparison because of the different time units, but the differences are of the order that, if the test could be made, they might well be regarded as random sampling fluctuations. Apart from sampling error, another consideration which makes it difficult to be clear on the relative degree of effort exerted by the two samples is the structure of the labour market in the two communities. The more firms there are in a given line of business, the easier it is for a worker, without going out of his past range of experience, to contact a large number of firms. We have no data to make possible an analysis of the effect of this kind of structural difference between communities.

The figures in the table require some explanation. We asked people to name the firms they had contacted. The firms were then placed into the categories shown in the table. An entry in the table means that a person contacted one or more firm in the category. Only people who had made contacts are included in the table.

TABLE 4-37

Kinds of Firm from Which Respondents Sought Employment,
by Sex, in Percentages of Responses

<u>Categories</u>	<u>January Cases</u>		<u>Longer-Term Cases</u>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Steel Companies	58	12	52	35
Other Major Manufacturing*	36	12	31	54
Manufacturing - other	39	12	51	62
Restaurants	6	12	5	19
Utilities, Transport (cabs) and Communication	19	8	4	--
Hospitals	11	12	3	--
Retail Outlets	22	69	19	46
Construction	3	4	1	--
Other	<u>3</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>19</u>
Total	197** (n=36)	183** (n=26)	183** (n=69)	235** (n=26)

* Dominion Glass, Otis Elevator, International Harvester, Firestone, Proctor & Gamble, Westinghouse.

**Percentages do not add to 100 due to multiple responses.

Over three-quarters of both the January males and longer-term males had contacted manufacturing firms. More than half had contacted the steel making firms. More than two-thirds of the longer-term females contacted manufacturing firms as well, although they were much less likely to try the steel companies. (Of course, they were often looking for a different type of work than the males, but they were trying the same firms.) On the other hand, just over one-fifth of the short-term females made calls on manufacturing firms. About two-thirds had called on retail stores. Another two-fifths, placed in the "other" category, had called on offices in search of clerical work.

One consequence of the heavy concentration made by the males on manufacturing firms, especially the larger ones, was bound to be failure. Many of these firms at the time of the study were not hiring people with the level of education of most of the people we talked to. This point will be examined in more detail in Chapter 6.

Acceptable and Unacceptable Jobs

Whatever their focus of job seeking, most of the people we talked to said they would be willing to accept quite a variety of new jobs, if the jobs were offered. On the second interview, we asked people how they would react to an offer of each of six different jobs. Three of these are often held by members of either sex. Six others were more strongly sex linked. Three of these were mentioned to members of each sex. The minimum wage was specified in all cases, except that of assembly line worker. In this case, a wage of \$3.00 per hour was mentioned. The results for the jobs about which everyone was asked are shown in Table 4-38.

Only one-sixth would refuse the factory job. Around three-fifths would take a job as a salesclerk. Five-sixths or more would refuse a job doing door-to-door sales. Because of the number of cases involved, the answers on the sex-linked jobs are less meaningful.

TABLE 4-38

Responses to Hypothetical Offers of Employment as Door-to-Door Sales People, Salesclerks, or Factory Line Workers, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

January Cases

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Occupation</u>		
	<u>Door-to-Door Sales</u>	<u>Salesclerk in Retail Stores</u>	<u>Assembly Worker in Factory</u>
Would not take	83	43	17
Would take	6	39	63
Would take for short time	6	9	9
Would take until something else came up	6	9	11
Total	101* (n=54)	100 (n=54)	100 (n=54)

Longer-Term Cases

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Occupation</u>		
	<u>Door-to-Door Sales</u>	<u>Salesclerk in Retail Stores</u>	<u>Assembly Worker in Factory</u>
Would not take	87	35	18
Would take	10	50	70
Would take for short time	2	5	6
Would take until something else came up	2	11	6
Total	101* (n=68)	101* (n=68)	100 (n=68)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

But it may be worth noting that ninety per cent of the females would be willing to work as a grocery store cashier. More than half, on the other hand, would not take a job as a waitress. About three-fifths of the males would take a job as a short order cook or as a janitor. But two-thirds would not take a job as a parcel and pick up boy in a supermarket. It would appear, then, that while there are specific jobs that people will not take, there are many other jobs, for which people were not particularly looking, but which they would take. Many of these would seem to be jobs with relatively low status and relatively low pay. If people were in some ways being choosey, they did not seem to be insisting on something unattainable.

This observation is supported by the results of our questions on the lowest wages that people would be willing to work for. Our results are shown in Table 4-39.

TABLE 4-39

Responses to the Question, "What is the Minimum Weekly Income You Would Work For?", by Sex, for January Cases and Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

Responses	January Cases			Longer-Term Cases		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Up to \$49.99	10	19	14	5	10	6
\$50.00 to \$59.99	8	27	16	11	30	15
\$60.00 to \$69.99	10	30	18	25	27	25
\$70.00 to \$79.99	18	8	14	28	23	27
\$80.00 or more	55	17	39	31	11	28
Total	101* (n=51)	101* (n=37)	101* (n=88)	100 (n=78)	101* (n=44)	101* (n=122)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

The median figure for short-term males was just over \$80 a week. For the longer-term males, it was just over \$70. The short-term female, on the average, wanted just over \$60 a week, as did the longer-term females.* These figures are close to the wages people had received in the last jobs they had held. (They are, in each case, lower than the weekly wages received by other people they knew in the same age range who were not on welfare.) The main exception would be that those whose last jobs had been for less than forty hours a week wanted to bring the hours worked, and hence the income, up. Some wanted to move above the minimum wage. A few were holding out for something much better than their last job. But, on the average, it seems that people would be content to go back into the labour force at around the level they had been at before.

Now whether they would be able to do so depends on many things: how hard they looked, whether they looked in the right places, what qualifications they had, and perhaps, to a certain degree, on luck. We will be looking at these matters in Chapters 5 and 6. But before we move on to do so, let us try to sum up the most significant findings of this Chapter.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Some Generalizations

We have pointed out in Chapter 3 that the population being studied was quite diverse. We have also seen a good deal of variety in the answers to many of the questions in this Chapter. What generalizations can be made? If we insist that a statement be true in two cases out of three before we admit it as a useful generalization, there are relatively few. But the ones there are seem to be worth noting.

*For both samples and both sex groups, the figures tended to rise with age, although for the short-term females the trend was not statistically significant.

1. More than two-thirds of the longer-term cases we talked to had grown up in Hamilton-Wentworth.
2. Two-thirds of both samples had not completed high school.
3. More than two-thirds had been given little or no encouragement by their parents to go farther in school.
4. More than two-thirds came from families that had never been on welfare.
5. More than two-thirds say there are essential or very important things they cannot do because of their incomes.
6. Apart from income considerations, more than three-quarters say it would be better to be working than on welfare.
7. More than two-thirds visit friends and have friends in to visit at least once a week.
8. More than two-thirds say they never use marijuana or stronger drugs.
9. When asked what they planned to do over the next six months, more than two-thirds mentioned getting a job.
10. More than two-thirds mentioned getting a job as one of their basic hopes for the future.

Some Common Responses

There are also some other points which, if they are not so generally true, are true often enough to be worth some attention.

1. Of those we talked to who had come to Hamilton on their own, about half said they had come here to look for work.
2. About half said the reason they left school was because they were bored, could not hack it, or could not get along with the staff.
3. More than half of those who grew up in Hamilton-Wentworth, close to one-third of all the cases, were living at home.
4. More than half of those with fathers in the labour force came from families where the father's occupational status was in the lowest two of the seven categories we used.
5. About one-half said that they were basically content with their situation.

6. About half of the people we talked to had friends who were also on welfare.
7. Most of the friends of our respondents either did not know they were on welfare or were indifferent to the fact.
8. Close to half of the parents of our respondents either did not know they were on welfare, were indifferent, or took a positive attitude to it.
9. The most common suggestion for changes in the welfare system made by both the short-term and the longer-term cases was that more money should be provided.
10. Just under half said they agreed with the idea of common law marriages.
11. At the same time, more than half of the longer-term cases, and close to two-thirds of the short-term cases, said they wanted to get married (common law unions not included).
12. About one-half had a specific type of work they were looking for.
13. More than half gave answers to a series of open-ended questions that suggested they wanted material success or security in the future. Almost as many wanted some form of positive human relations, ordinarily marriage.

On the other questions we asked, the answers were ordinarily highly varied. This was particularly the case with questions on employment. People had handled a wide variety of jobs at a wide variety of wages. They had liked and disliked quite different things about them. They had quite different perceptions of their chances for finding work, and quite different minimum acceptable salary figures.

More important for our purposes, there was quite a wide range of levels of job seeking. About one-quarter had not been out looking for work in the preceding two weeks. On the other hand, about one-sixth had been out ten times or more.

Comparisons Among Groups

As we noted in Chapter 2, we wanted to compare short-term and longer-term cases. Throughout this Chapter, we have presented the data on the two groups together. In only a few cases were there significant differences. The longer-term cases were more likely to have grown up in Hamilton-Wentworth, to have low levels of schooling, and to say their chances of finding work were poor. They were more inclined than the short-term cases to want to see improvements in the administration of the welfare system. They were also more negative in their attitudes to drugs. On other questions, the groups were very much the same. Considering the range of questions asked and the number on which there were no significant differences, it would seem that the two samples should be thought of as essentially alike.

We were also interested in comparing the sexes. Here, too, there were few significant differences. Females were less likely to have grown up outside Hamilton-Wentworth. They were less likely to have left school because they found it a negative experience. Otherwise, the differences seemed to result from sex-typing of occupations. The sexes had had a different pattern of previous jobs, and were looking for a different pattern. They had had different average pay levels, and were willing to work for different amounts. In other respects, the sexes were very much alike.

* * * * *

In this Chapter, we have reviewed some basic data on the groups under study. A major question has arisen as to why levels of job seeking were what they were. This will be considered in the following chapter.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 5 - LEVELS OF JOB SEEKING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Correlations With Job Seeking	5-2
- Personal Background	5-3
- Employment History and Employment Goals	5-10
- Styles of Life	5-12
- Personality Characteristics	5-18
- Hopes for the Future	5-22
- Summary	5-25
Indexes To Predict Job Seeking	5-26
- Results of Regression for January Cases	5-27
- Results of Regression for the Longer-term Cases .	5-29
Patterns Of Answers	5-31
- The Method of Classification	5-33
- Job Seeking Categories for the Short-term cases .	5-37
- Job Seeking Categories for the Longer-term cases .	5-46

CHAPTER 5

LEVELS OF JOB SEEKING

In this chapter, we will review our findings on levels of job seeking. First we will deal with correlations between job seeking and other characteristics. Then we will describe our efforts to develop an index that would predict levels of job seeking. Finally, we will discuss patterns of answers which were given only by people whose job seeking efforts were at about the same level.

We will be using the number of times people had looked for work in the two weeks before the first interview as our measure of job seeking effort. Another measure that has been used is the number of methods used in looking for work. But such methods as sending out resumés and registering with employment agencies other than Manpower were rarely used. The only method widely used was calling on employers. In view of this, we could have used the number of firms contacted as a measure of job seeking effort. But we had collected these data for a three month time span. Over this long a period, there could be lapses of memory. We asked people how often they had looked for work over just a two week period, so memory lapses seemed unlikely to be a problem with these data.

Some readers may wonder how accurately people would report their level of job seeking. There is a good deal of evidence that in surveys people sometimes try to give answers that will put themselves in a good light. Might this have happened in this case?

Now, of course, we cannot be certain that any given individual told the truth. But there are two reasons to believe that our data are basically sound. The first is that people who reported that they had been out looking for work five times or more in the past two weeks were twice as likely to find jobs over the course of the study as those who reported lower levels of effort. We could find no significant

intervening variables. The second reason is that so many reported that they had not looked at all. If people had been trying to put themselves in the best light, they would presumably have overstated their efforts. Over one-quarter of our respondents said that they had not looked for work at all. Another quarter said they had looked only once or twice. Since so many people reported such low levels of effort, and since those who reported higher levels were more likely to find work, it would seem that the data could not have been too seriously distorted by overstatement.

We had hoped to analyze changes in levels of job seeking. But most of those who had been looking more than five times a week on the first call were no longer on welfare by the time of the second. Of those who were still on, only about one-seventh of those who had not looked for work in the last two weeks at the time of the first call had gone out five times or more before the second, or vice versa. The result was that we had too few cases involving more than quite small changes to allow for meaningful analysis.

CORRELATIONS WITH JOB SEEKING

As we have pointed out in Chapter 1, we wanted to test almost every item in the questionnaire for an association with job seeking. We have done just that. But we cannot report on all of the results. We will report only associations strong enough that they would have arisen by chance less than once on twenty occasions. If a question is not mentioned here, the reader may assume that its association with job seeking was too weak to meet this criterion. If a trend is mentioned, but is said not to be statistically significant, it will also mean that the association was too weak to meet this criterion.

It should be noted that in this section of this chapter, as in Chapter 4, figures for the longer-term cases have been obtained by weighting the sub-samples.

It should also be noted that with the amount of data we

gathered, several associations this strong could well have arisen by chance. Accordingly, where a significant association has appeared in one sample but no appreciable association has appeared in the other, we have suggested some caution about the finding.

We will report on the association between job seeking and other items under five headings:

1. Personal Background
2. Employment History and Job Related Goals
3. Styles of Life
4. Personality Characteristics
5. Hopes for the Future

1. Personal Background

Under this heading, there are six things that make a difference - age, sex, where the respondent grew up, whether his parents had been on welfare, whether they encouraged him to stay in school, and what he would like to change in his past.

Age

First, let us look at age. Table 5-1 shows a positive relationship between age and job seeking among the January cases. Among the sixteen and seventeen year olds, a full third had not gone out to look for work in the last two weeks. Among those over twenty, only one-sixth had not looked. Six per cent of the sixteen and seventeen year olds had been out ten times or more. Almost five times as many as those over twenty had looked this often.

Although the trend is weaker (and not statistically significant), age and job seeking were positively related among the longer-term cases as well. The trend was stronger for newcomers to the rolls because of a group of very recent school drop-outs, all of them sixteen or seventeen years old, who had just come onto the rolls. None of them had looked for work in the last two weeks. There was no similar group among the longer-term cases. So the job seeking level for sixteen and seventeen year olds was higher.

TABLE 5-1

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Age, for January Cases, in Percentages

Frequency of Looking	<u>Age</u>			
	<u>17 & under</u>	<u>18-20</u>	<u>21-25</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	33	30	17	27
1 - 2	39	25	8	23
3 - 4	6	18	21	16
5 - 9	17	13	25	17
10 or more	<u>6</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	101* (n=18)	101* (n=40)	100 (n=24)	100 (n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sex

Among the longer-term cases, males looked harder than females. Even if we leave out those who had young children, almost half of the females had not looked for work in the past two weeks. Less than one-fifth of the males had not.

The difference between the sexes appears to increase with the length of time on welfare. Among the short-term cases on the second round, two-thirds of the females had not been looking for work. Only one half of the males had not. Among the short-term cases on the first round, there was no appreciable difference between the

In this case, the females remaining on welfare would tend to be less active job seekers than the males.

Neither suggestion seems likely. There is no trend up or down in job seeking between the first and second interview for either sex.* Males and females among the short-term cases found jobs about equally often.

Shepherd and Belitsky have reported that males in their sample contacted more firms than females. They have suggested that the reason was that there were more attractive jobs for men than for women.**

This explanation, if applied to our data, would require modification to account for the fact that among newcomers to the rolls, on the first call, there was no difference between the sexes. It could be suggested that it is only for the better educated females that there are attractive jobs open, whereas relatively less well educated males can often find work that at least does not pay badly. If both the well educated females and the well educated males found work quickly, then, among those remaining, the females would have less reason to look actively. There are two difficulties with this suggestion. One is that there is no correlation between level of education and level of job seeking. The other is that females tended to have lower minimum acceptable wages than males.

* There is a drop in job seeking between the first and second round of interviewing for the short-term cases, but this appears to be because those who were looking hardest at the time of the first call had very often found jobs by the time of the second.

**op. cit., pp. 53-54.

Where People Grew Up

People who came to Hamilton from other centres were likely to be very active in looking for work. Table 5-2 shows the relationship between levels of job seeking and where people had grown up for the January cases.

TABLE 5-2

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Where the Respondent Grew Up, for January Cases,
in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Grew Up in Ontario</u>	<u>Grew Up Elsewhere</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	34	5	27
1 - 2	27	10	23
3 - 4	13	25	16
5 - 9	18	15	17
10 or more	8	45	17
Total	100 (n=62)	100 (n=20)	100 (n=82)

Those who grew up outside Ontario were much more active. More than one-third of those who grew up in Ontario had not been looking at all. Another quarter had been looking only once or twice. But only three of the twenty who had grown up outside of Ontario had been looking less than three times. Nine of the twenty had been out looking for work ten times or more. Only eight per cent of those who grew up in Ontario looked as often.

As it happens, there is no difference between those who grew up in Ontario and those who grew up elsewhere among the longer-term

cases. A difference shows up among the short-term cases because of a group of people who had arrived in Hamilton quite recently, looking for work. Most of them were teetotallers, and never used drugs. Most said the most important thing in their lives was getting a job. Most said they wanted to marry and settle down. And most of them were looking for work five times a week or more.

It might be expected that a group of this kind would tend to find work rather quickly. Most did. Those who did not had usually moved back to where they had come from by the end of the study. If newcomers to the city who are looking for work very actively either find it or go back to where they came from, those who remain on the rolls for a longer period are likely to be much more like those who grew up locally. This seems a likely explanation for why there is a difference among those who had grown up in Ontario and those who grew up elsewhere among the short-term cases but not among the longer-term cases.

Parents on Welfare

Table 5-3 shows the difference, for the January cases, between those whose parents had been on welfare and those whose parents had not.

About two-fifths of those whose parents had received welfare said they had not looked for work in the last two weeks. About one-fifth of those whose parents had not gave the same reply. At the other end of the scale, more than two-fifths of those whose parents had never been on welfare said they had been looking for work more than five times. Less than a quarter of those whose parents had been on welfare said that they had been looking this often.

There is a parallel difference among the longer-term cases. Among the longer-term cases, the difference is not quite statistically significant. But since the trend is in the same direction, it would seem to lend some support to the notion that people whose parents

have been on welfare are likely to be less active in looking for work than those whose parents have not.

It should be noted that socio-economic status in general does not seem to be involved. The occupational status scores for father's occupations were unrelated to job seeking.

TABLE 5-3

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Whether Parents had Received Public Assistance,
for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Parents Have Received P.A.</u>	<u>Parents Have Not Received P.A.</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	39	21	27
1 - 2	27	21	23
3 - 4	12	18	16
5 - 9	15	18	17
10 or more	8	21	17
Total	101* (n=26)	99* (n=56)	100 (n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Encouragement to Stay in School

Parental influence also shows up in the relationship between encouragement to stay in school and job seeking efforts. This is shown in Table 5-4.

The question about parental encouragement was asked only on the second interview, so the numbers are rather small, but the results are revealing, nevertheless. Among the January cases, fully two-thirds of those who said that they received no encouragement to stay in school had not been looking for work. Less than two-fifths

of those who said they had received some degree of encouragement had not been looking. There was a trend in the same direction among the longer-term cases, although it was not quite strong enough to be statistically significant. But, since it was in the same direction, it would seem to support the idea that there is a connection between encouragement to stay in school at one point and job seeking at a later date.

TABLE 5-4

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Amount of Parental Encouragement to Stay in School,
for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Amount of Encouragement</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>None</u>	<u>Slight to Strong</u>	
0	67	38	53
1 - 4	11	27	19
5 or more	22	35	28
Total	100 (n=27)	100 (n=26)	100 (n=53)

Possibly, parents who encouraged their children to stay in school were strongly interested in occupational success for their children. Their children may have adopted the same values. We do not know, but the suggestion is at least plausible.

Desired Changes in Life

On the second interview, we asked people what things they would like to change in the way their lives had been so far. We

received a wide variety of answers. About one-third said they wished they had gone farther with their schooling. Among the January cases, just over thirty per cent of those who said they wished they had gone farther, had not been looking for work. Three-fifths of those who had not given this reply had not been looking. Among the longer-term cases, the proportions were about the same but, for some reason, many people did not answer the question, so the results could not be considered very precise.

2. Employment History and Employment Goals

We had expected that a person's employment history and his employment goals would influence how hard he looked for work. We were almost completely mistaken. The kinds of jobs people had had, and what they liked and disliked about them, showed little relation to looking for work. The level of income a person wanted, and the types of job he wanted were no more helpful. Nor was there any association between a person's estimate of how likely he was to find work and how hard he was looking. The only factor that was significantly associated with frequency of looking for work was the number of jobs people had had in the past two years. Our data for the longer-term cases are shown in Table 5-5.

Even in this case, there were no very dramatic differences. Among the longer-term cases, those who had had no jobs in the preceding two years had, on the average, looked for work once a week less than those who had had jobs. The difference between those who had had jobs and those who had not was sharper among the short-term cases, but the number who had had no jobs was too small to make the comparison very meaningful.

Why those who had had jobs should be looking harder than those who had not cannot be determined from our data. Perhaps those who had had jobs before had more confidence. Perhaps they had learned from experience that getting a job is, among other things, a matter

of the number of contacts you make. Perhaps those who had had jobs before were simply people who had always had a greater interest in finding work.

TABLE 5-5

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Number of Jobs Held in the Preceding Two Years,
for Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Number of Jobs Held</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>None</u>	<u>1 - 4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	
0	31	24	--	25
1 - 2	26	20	20	21
3 - 4	11	20	--	15
5 - 9	18	14	45	18
10 or more	15	22	35	20
Total	101* (n=33)	100 (n=61)	100 (n=9)	99* (n=103)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Another suggestion might be that those who had not had jobs in the last two years were more likely to have spent time in jail. Perhaps some of them preferred to make their money illegally. As it happens, among the longer-term cases, those who, to our knowledge, had been in trouble with the law were no more likely than those who had not to have had at least one job in the last two years. Among the short-term cases, those who had been in trouble were slightly less likely not to have had a job.

Difficulty with the Law

But among the longer-term cases, there is an association between having been convicted in Magistrate's Court in the past year and frequency of job seeking. Forty per cent of those who had looked for work twice or less in the last two weeks had been convicted. Only twenty-four per cent of those who had looked for work three to nine times had been convicted. None of those who had looked for work ten times or more had been convicted. There is no similar trend among the short-term cases. Why a trend should appear among the longer-term cases but not among the January cases seems impossible to explain from our data.

3. Styles of Life

Contentment

It was pointed out in Chapter 4 that those who expressed contentment with their situation were likely those who were least affected by not having a job. Not surprisingly then, those who expressed contentment were not looking for work as hard as those who did not. Table 5-6 shows our data for the January cases. One-third of those who expressed contentment had not looked for work in the past two weeks. Only one-sixth of those who were not content had not looked. More than one-quarter of those who were not content had gone out to look ten times or more. Just over one-tenth of the contented had done this.

The trend is weaker among the longer-term cases, but could have arisen by chance less than once on ten occasions. So it would seem to lend support to the notion that contentment with life while on welfare will reduce job seeking effort.

TABLE 5-6

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Presence or Absence of Responses Showing Contentment,
for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Those Who Did Not Show Con- tentment</u>	<u>Those Who Showed Con- tentment</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	17	34	27
1 - 2	17	28	23
3 - 4	23	11	16
5 - 9	17	17	17
10 or more	<u>26</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	100 (n=35)	101* (n=47)	100 (n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

As we have noted in Chapter 4, eighty per cent of those who expressed either contentment or dissatisfaction with their situation did not express the other feeling. If we had drawn up tables for dissatisfaction, they would have shown the reverse of what is seen in Table 5-4.

Sometimes people's dissatisfaction with their situation went far enough that we coded it as "depression". The term was not used in an extreme sense. Few were so at odds with themselves or the world that it immobilized them. But some spoke of being depressed

or being down in the dumps, or being extremely unhappy about their situation. Those whose answers were coded as depressed were likely to be looking for work more often than those whose answers were not coded this way. Among the longer-term cases on the second round, the results were statistically significant.* On the first round and among the short-term cases, they were not. These results call into question the generality of the association between being depressed and job seeking effort.

Leisure Activities

We also suggested in Chapter 4 that one reason why those who were content felt the way they did was that they had very active social lives. Among the short-term cases, frequency of having friends in was negatively related to job seeking. More than five-sixths of those who had not been out looking for work had friends in at least once a week. Among those who had been looking, just over three-fifths had friends in this often.**

On the other hand, those few who were members of groups and organizations tended to look harder than others. Table 5-7 shows our data for the short-term cases. Three-tenths of those who never attended meetings had not looked for work in the last two weeks. Only one-eighth of those who had attended meetings had not looked. One-quarter of those who never attended meetings had been out five times or more. Almost three-quarters of those who attended meetings had been out this often.

* One other variable, also involving a negative view of the world, was significantly associated with job seeking among the January cases, on the first round. This was an indication of pessimism about the state of the world in general. It did not show a significant association with job seeking on the second round, or among the longer-term cases.

**Generally speaking, the frequency of going out to visit friends was negatively associated with looking for work. But the trend was never strong enough to be statistically significant.

TABLE 5-7

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Frequency of Attending Meetings of Groups or
Organizations, for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Attendance at Meetings</u>		
	<u>Various Frequencies</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	12	31	27
1 - 2	12	27	23
3 - 4	12	17	16
5 - 9	47	11	17
10 or more	<u>27</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	100 (n=17)	100 (n=64)	100 (n=82)

Now, in view of the numbers, the figures for those who attended meetings should not be taken too literally. Then too, those who attended meetings among the longer-term cases showed no appreciable difference from those who did not. So perhaps we should not attach too much importance to the association between attending meetings and looking for work. Nevertheless, it is clear that, at least among the short-term cases, those who had some ties to organizations were more actively looking for work than others.

Drugs

Use of alcohol, use of marijuana and attitudes to drug use were all related to job seeking. Table 5-8 shows the relationship between alcohol use and frequency of job seeking.

TABLE 5-8

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Frequency of Drinking Alcohol, for January Cases, in
Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Frequency of Drinking</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Rarely, Never</u>	<u>Occasion- ally</u>	<u>More Often</u>	
0	19	19	38	27
1 - 2	19	19	29	23
3 - 4	10	26	15	16
5 - 9	24	22	9	17
10 or more	<u>29</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	101* (n=34)	101* (n=27)	100 (n=21)	100 (n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Among those who never, rarely, or occasionally drank alcohol, just under one-fifth had not been looking for work. Among those who drank it more often, the proportion doubled. More than half of those who rarely or never drank had been looking more than ten times in the past two weeks. Three-eighths of those who drank occasionally had done the same. Less than one-fifth of those who drank more often had been looking this hard.

The trend for the longer-term cases is in the same direction but is not strong. One reason why the trend is stronger among the short-term cases is the special group of people from outside of Ontario whom we mentioned above. Most of these people, as we said before, rarely or never drank and most were looking for work very hard. If we take out this group, the difference between those who rarely or never drink and the others largely disappears.

Marijuana

Frequency of marijuana use had the same relationship to job seeking for both the longer-term and the short-term cases. Among the longer-term cases, forty per cent of those who were not looking for work used it. The figure declines as job seeking rises, until among those looking five times or more less than fifteen per cent use it. A similar trend exists among the short-term cases. But the numbers involved are smaller, so the trend could have arisen by chance about once on fifteen occasions.

Attitudes to Drug Use

Problems of numbers also arose with attitudes to drugs. It was pointed out in Chapter 4 that relatively few among the longer-term cases had anything good to say about drug use. In fact, there were too few to be used in analysis of job seeking. Among the short-term cases, there were enough to provide a meaningful, if not very precise result. About one-quarter of those contacted on the second round of interviews said that they like to use drugs or that drugs could help you to learn about yourself. Among this group, none had been out looking for work in the previous two weeks. Now this result is too simple for us to readily believe that it would not be modified if the sample were larger. Certainly, some of the few longer-term cases who had something favourable to say about drugs had been looking for work. But along with our data on marijuana use, these data on attitudes to drug use do suggest that a favourable view of drugs, or at least of soft drugs, is linked to low levels of job seeking.

Views on Common Law Unions

The same is true of views on common law unions, at least among the January cases. Among those we interviewed on the second round, about two-fifths said they agreed with common law marriages or thought they were a good idea. Of these people, three-quarters had not looked for work in the past two weeks. Among those who did not give this favourable response, about four-sevenths had been looking

for work. Among the longer-term cases, there was no association between views on common law unions and efforts in finding work. Why there should be an association in one sample but not in the other seems quite unclear.

4. Personality Characteristics

We asked a good number of questions about personality characteristics. Five were related to looking for work, four among the January cases and one among the longer-term cases.

Two of the characteristics that were related to looking for work among the January cases were part of a series designed to get an idea of the vitality of our respondents. In each case, people were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a statement. The responses have been classed as "true" and "less than true". Disagreement, neutrality, and qualified agreement were all placed in the latter category. The results are shown in Tables 5-9 and 5-10.

The first statement shown is, "I like to hear about new ideas." Of the eighteen people who did not agree fully with the statement, sixteen had looked for work twice or less. Three-fifths of those who agreed with this statement had looked more often.

The second statement is, "I like to work out new ways of doing things." Just over one-third of those who said the statement was true had looked for work twice or less. More than two-thirds of those who did not say the statement was true had looked this infrequently.

The two statements have in common an appreciation of new things. Perhaps the fact that both are related to job seeking may mean that a certain alertness is a characteristic associated with looking for work. This suggestion is supported by the fact that the trend in the data on the second question was in the same direction, although it was not quite statistically significant, among the longer-term cases.

TABLE 5-9

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Responses to the Statement, "I like to hear about
new ideas.", for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Responses</u>		
	<u>True</u>	<u>Less Than True</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	22	45	27
1 - 2	17	45	23
3 - 4	20	--	16
5 - 9	20	5	17
10 or more	<u>20</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	99*	100	100
	(n=64)	(n=18)	(n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

* * * * *

TABLE 5-10

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Responses to the Statement, "I like to work out new
ways of doing things.", for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Responses</u>		
	<u>True</u>	<u>Less Than True</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	17	40	27
1 - 2	19	29	23
3 - 4	21	9	16
5 - 9	23	9	17
10 or more	<u>19</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	99*	101*	100
	(n=47)	(n=35)	(n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

The other two characteristics that were associated with job seeking for the January cases are not nearly so closely related. On the second round of interviews, we asked people how much they liked twelve different ways of living. Responses to the two that were associated with job seeking are shown in Tables 5-11 and 5-12.

The first of these statements is intended to express the belief that a person should try to enjoy as many experiences as possible without becoming too tied down to anything. Among those who had not looked for work at all, fifty per cent said they liked this very much. Among those who looked one to four times, thirty per cent said they liked it very much. Among those who looked five times or more, only twenty per cent said they liked it very much.

The second statement is intended to express a love of privacy, self-understanding, and independence. Among those who had not looked for work, one-third said they liked this very much. The figure rose to two-thirds among those who had gone out to look for work five times or more. Among those who had not looked at all, fifty per cent disliked it. Just over one-quarter of those who had looked five times or more disliked it.

One problem in assessing these results is that the trends in the data for the longer-term cases run in the opposite direction. The trends there are not statistically significant, but they certainly raise the question of how general the results we have seen may be.

A similar problem arises with the one personality item that showed a specific relation to job seeking among the longer-term cases. This was the question, "Do you ever worry about your ability to do the things people expect of you or ask of you?" Among the longer-term cases, three-tenths of those who looked twice or less said they sometimes did worry about this. More than half of those who had looked more often said they did. But among the short-term cases, it was those who looked least who were most likely to worry. The trend among the January cases was not statistically significant, but the reversal of direction does raise a question about the generality of the connections between worrying about abilities and job seeking.

TABLE 5-11

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks, by Responses to the Statement, "I enjoy life as much as I possibly can, let myself go. I don't spend too much time on any one thing because there are so many experiences to enjoy. I avoid strong attachments to other people. I enjoy a lively social time, but need some time to myself.", for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency of Looking</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>0</u>	<u>1 - 4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	
Like very much	50	30	20	38
Like slightly	23	30	47	31
Indifferent or dislike	27	40	33	31
—	—	—	—	—
Total	100 (n=30)	100 (n=10)	100 (n=15)	100 (n=55)

* * * * *

TABLE 5-12

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks, by Responses to the Statement, "I like to be alone, live in a private place and have lots of time to myself. I try to understand myself and I avoid depending on other people.", for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency of Looking</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>0</u>	<u>1 - 4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	
Like	33	40	66	44
Indifferent	17	30	7	16
Dislike	50	30	27	40
Total	100 (n=30)	100 (n=10)	100 (n=15)	100 (n=55)

5. Hopes for the Future

The same problem arises when we consider people's hopes for the future. In Chapter 4, we mentioned that we expected that people who lived day by day would not look for work as hard as those who believed in planning for the future. For the January cases, this held good. The relationship between saying the future needs planning and looking for work among the January cases is shown in Table 5-13.

TABLE 5-13

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Presence or Absence of Responses Favouring Planning
Ahead, for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>No Responses</u>	<u>One or More Responses</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	40	9	27
1 - 2	25	21	23
3 - 4	15	18	16
5 - 9	10	27	17
10 or more	<u>10</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	100 (n=48)	102* (n=34)	100 (n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Two-fifths of those who did not mention a belief in planning ahead had not looked at all. Only about one-tenth of those who mentioned the need to plan had not looked. At the other extreme,

more than half of those who favoured planning for the future had looked more than five times in the past two weeks. Only one-fifth of those did not mention the need to plan for the future had looked this hard.

So far, so good. But there is very little relationship between a statement on the need to plan ahead or the desirability of living day to day and looking for work on the second round of interviews for the January cases. Nor was there any strong relationship among the longer-term cases on the first round. On the second round of interviews with the longer-term cases, exactly the opposite results arose. Just over half of those who had not looked for work in the last two weeks said they believed in living day by day. But more than three-quarters of those who had looked said they believed in living this way.

The sample is smaller, of course, and the trend was not so strong as among the January cases on the first round. Nevertheless, it was strong enough that it could have arisen by chance less than once in one hundred times. So the reversal of results cannot be easily dismissed. We do not know why it should occur.

Fortunately, the other associations between job seeking and views of the future did not suffer from this sort of a confusion. All of these were strong enough among the January cases that they would have arisen by chance less than once in one hundred times. All of these were supported by trends in the same direction in the other sample.

The first significant relationship was found in the answers to the question, "What do you plan to do over the next six months?" Among those who had not been looking for work in the last two weeks, fifty per cent answered, "Get a job." Among those who had been looking for work, more than three-quarters gave this reply.

TABLE 5-14

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks,
by Presence or Absence of Responses Showing Desire for
Employment, for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>No Responses</u>	<u>One or More Responses</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	48	19	27
1 - 2	22	24	23
3 - 4	9	19	16
5 - 9	4	22	17
10 or more	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	100 (n=23)	101* (n=59)	100 (n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

We also asked people a series of open-ended questions about the future. These are described in Chapter 4. The most common thing mentioned as a hope for the future was finding work. The data are shown in Table 5-14. Just under half of those who did not mention this had not been looking for work. Only nineteen per cent of those who mentioned it had not been looking.

Those who mentioned getting a job as one of their major hopes for the future were less likely than others to mention a desire for positive human relations, ordinarily marriage. So it is consistent with the results just reported that those who mentioned this desire were likely to look for work less often than those who did not mention it. The data are shown in Table 5-15. Among those who did mention it, only one-third had been looking for work at all. A similar number had gone out to look at least five times. Among

those who did mention it, seventy-two per cent had not looked at all. Just one-fifth had been out five times or more.

TABLE 5-15

Frequency of Looking for Work in the Preceding Two Weeks, by Presence or Absence of Responses Showing Desire for Positive Human Relationships, for January Cases, in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>No Responses</u>	<u>One or More Responses</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	35	72	54
1 - 4	31	7	18
5 or more	<u>35</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>29</u>
Total	101* (n=26)	100 (n=29)	101* (n=82)

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Now all of these relationships were supported by trends in the same direction among the longer-term cases. So it appears quite clear that one factor influencing the level of job seeking is the extent to which getting a job is seen as an important aim for the future.

Summary

As it happens, we do not have a great number of such unambiguous findings. Among the associations we have reported, some appear to have resulted from special groups. Questions were raised about the generality of others. But some seem to be quite clear. People whose parents had not been on welfare and who encouraged them to stay in school

tended to look harder. Those who had jobs in the last two years tended to look harder than those who had not. Those who were contented with their situation and who had friends in relatively often did not look as hard as those who were dissatisfied and had friends in less frequently. Those who used marijuana or who were favourable to drug use did not look as hard as others. Those who said they liked to hear about new ideas or to work out new ways of doing things tended to look harder than those who did not. Finally, as we have just seen, those whose major expressed goals for the future included getting a job looked harder than others.

INDEXES TO PREDICT JOB SEEKING

Unfortunately, though, none of the questions associated with job seeking was a very good predictor. No individual item will explain more than one-eighth of the variance among the January cases or one-twelfth among the longer-term cases. So we had to see whether some combination of items would do what individual items would not.

We had hoped that particular sets of questions might serve as indexes. For example, if someone

- had disliked his previous job,
- felt he was getting enough money from welfare,
- was not interested in any further education or job training, and
- did not mention employment as a hope for the future,

it might be expected that he would not be looking very hard for work. But, as we have seen, only one of these items, hope for employment in the future, was significantly associated with job seeking. Adding in the others did not produce any appreciable increase in our ability to predict levels of job seeking. We met with no greater success in any of the other sets of questions we had hoped might work.

Accordingly, we decided to try a step-wise regression analysis. Readers not familiar with this procedure may find some comments on what is involved helpful. People's answers to a set of questions are fed into a computer. The computer then selects the one question whose answers most effectively predict the answers to the question being analyzed. At the next step, it selects the question which will improve the prediction made in the first step as much as possible. At successive steps, it locates the question which will improve the prediction already made the most. At each step, a prediction equation is worked out, showing the weighting that must be given to each of the questions used for prediction to get the best results.

Two general limitations of this procedure should be pointed out. One is that it may produce results that do not make a great deal of sense. The thing that is important is prediction. If the best prediction can be made by a set of items that defies interpretation, that set will, nevertheless, be chosen. The second limitation is that the method tends to work best with a population which is not divided into sub-groups. If there are distinct sub-groups, things that produce effective predictions in one may not work for another. In this case, it may be impossible to develop a good prediction for the group as a whole.

One further limitation must be noted in this case. We cannot tell how likely it is that the results we have obtained may have arisen by chance. The assumptions that are ordinarily made to estimate this simply do not hold.

Results of Regression for January Cases

With these limitations in mind, let us see what regression will tell us. Let us look first at the results from the January cases.

The items in the prediction equation are:

1. Where did you grow up? (Coded as - Ontario, 1 and Outside of Ontario, 2)
2. Presence (Coded 1) or absence (Coded 0) of answers showing pessimism about the future among the answers to the open-ended questions at the end of the interview.
3. Have you registered with unemployment agencies other than Manpower? (Coded as - Yes, 1 and No, 2)
4. How much time do you spend watching television? (This was coded in hours per week.)
5. Do you smoke marijuana? (Coded as - never, 2 and sometimes, 1)
6. I find it hard to understand perfectionists. (Coded 1 to 5 according to the degree of agreement with the statement.)
7. Presence (Coded 1) or absence (Coded 0) of answers showing confidence in personal ability in the answers to the open-ended questions at the end of the interview.

The prediction formula is:

Level of job seeking =

$$3.54 \text{ (Item 1)} + 1.04 \text{ (Item 2)} - 4.12 \text{ (Item 3)} - .09 \text{ (Item 4)} \\ + 2.77 \text{ (Item 5)} + .62 \text{ (Item 6)} + 1.12 \text{ (Item 7)} + 5.49$$

The latter term is just a constant.

The formula will explain forty-one per cent of the variance in looking for work.* This is 3.4 times more than can be explained by

*We have, rather arbitrarily, decided to stop the procedure at the point at which adding further items to the prediction equations no longer improves the prediction by more than two per cent. This corresponds to the level at which, if the usual assumptions held good, the contributions made by additional variables would no longer be significant at the .05 level.

the best single item. Further, most of the items are readily explained. Those who registered with employment agencies might be expected to have greater than average interest in finding work and, hence, might be expected to look for work harder than others. Confidence in your own abilities might make it easier to approach employers. We have seen that marijuana use was negatively associated with looking for work. We have also suggested an explanation as to why those who had grown up outside Ontario looked harder than those who had grown up in Ontario.

The other items may not seem so clear. Why should those who find it relatively easy to understand perfectionists look for work more often than those who find it relatively hard? Why should those who watch a lot of television look less often than those who watch less of it? Of course, explanations can be suggested for these things. For example, perhaps those who find it hard to understand perfectionists are low on self-discipline. If so, perhaps they find it harder to buckle down to a job seeking campaign. The question, of course, is whether the potential explanations are persuasive.

In the last analysis, how much sense the items included in the prediction equation make must be decided by each reader. I expect, though, that there will be general agreement that the results for the January cases are less straightforward than those for the longer-term cases.

Regression Results for the Longer-term Cases

The items in the prediction equation for the longer-term cases will be familiar. All of them were individually associated with job seeking. The items are as follows:

1. Whether the respondent had been convicted in Magistrate's Court in the past year. (Coded as Yes, 1 or No, 0)
2. Sex (Male was Coded 1, female was Coded 2.)

3. Presence (Coded 1) or absence (Coded 2) of answers showing the respondent's dissatisfaction with his current situation among the answers to the open-ended questions at the end of the interview.
4. Do you smoke marijuana? (Coded as - never, 2 or sometimes, 1)
5. Presence (Coded 1) or absence (Coded 0) of desire for employment among responses to the open-ended questions at the end of the interview.
6. Responses to the statement, "I like to hear about new ideas." (Coded as - true, 1 and less than fully true, 2)

The prediction formula is:

Level of job seeking =

$$2.85 \text{ (Item 1)} - 3.23 \text{ (Item 2)} + .82 \text{ (Item 3)} + 1.67 \text{ (Item 4)} \\ + .55 \text{ (Item 5)} - .59 \text{ (Item 6)} + 5.12$$

The final term is just a constant.

The equation will explain the twenty-four per cent of the variance in job seeking among the longer-term cases. This is 2.9 times as much as could be explained by the best single item.* It appears that the items in the prediction equation for the longer-term cases are rather more readily understood than those for the short-term cases. On the other hand, they explain much less of the variance.

Trying to produce a fuller explanation of job seeking levels, we experimented with a number of variations in the regression procedure.

*We have, rather arbitrarily, stopped the procedure at the point at which adding further items to the equation no longer improved the prediction by more than one per cent. This corresponds to the level at which, if the usual assumptions held good, the contribution made by additional variables would no longer be significant at the .05 level.

The reader may have noticed that all of the items in the formulae were questions from the first round of interviewing. If we wanted to work with our total group of cases, we could not bring in questions from the second round. What would happen if we could use second round data? We did runs on the cases contacted on the second round of interviewing. As it happened, the results were not as good.* This may well have resulted from the fact that most of those who had been looking hardest on the first round had taken jobs before the second. Since we had lost most of them, we were, in effect, trying to develop a prediction equation to distinguish between those with low levels of job seeking and those with moderate levels. This turned out to be more difficult than developing a prediction equation for groups where both extremes were well represented.

In any case, we have succeeded in explaining forty-one per cent of the variance among the short-term cases and twenty-four per cent among the longer-term cases. Among the few previous studies of job seeking, none, to our knowledge, have attempted this form of analysis. So if we have explained only one-fifth to two-fifths of the variance, we have made a step forward.

PATTERNS OF ANSWERS

If possible, we wanted to go farther. One approach was suggested by the fact that some of the association between job seeking and other things seemed to result from special groups. Might there be other definable groups, which were much alike in job seeking?

There is no established method for identifying such groups. So we had to devise our own. While it has something in common with other methods of "prediction by classification", it appears, in some respects, to be unique. So what we have done should be spelled out.

*We also tried log-linear regression on the total samples, with results less satisfactory than those reported.

Readers who are interested in our findings, but not greatly concerned about details of method may prefer to skip to page 5-37, where we begin to present our results.

First, we had to decide what sort of groups we would look for. How much alike in job seeking and other characteristics should they be? Was it as important to define groups with middle levels of job seeking as it was to define groups at the extreme ends of the scale? What did we do with people who met the criteria for inclusion in more than one group? Let us look at these questions in turn.

a) Homogeneity of Groups

The most important question was how much alike the groups should be in job seeking. It was decided that they should be similar enough that a group of the same size, drawn by chance from the people we interviewed, would be less alike at least ninety-nine times out of one hundred.*

It was decided further that each group should be defined by a pattern of answers on other topics. Every case in the category would have to display the same pattern. In other respects, they could be quite alike or quite different.

*The sum of differences from the group mean would be used as a measure of similarity. The distance between cases could be measured in rank scores. The absolute scores were not used because they would have posed very great difficulties in grouping people at the upper end of the scale. More than half of our cases are concentrated in the range from 0 to 2. The upper one-quarter or three-tenths are strung out in a range between 5 and 20. For example, among the January cases, twenty-two people out of eighty-two were not looking for work. So ranking the cases from the lowest level to the highest, these cases would be assigned a rank score of 11.5. At the other end of the scale, the three who had gone out looking for work more than fifteen times were given a rank score of eighty-one. To decide whether a group was homogeneous enough to meet our criterion required an enumeration of the combinations of cases which would yield greater homogeneity.

b) Levels of Job Seeking

It appeared from our knowledge of the cases that it would be easier to define groups at the ends of the scale than in the middle. Then, too, if we could sort out why some people were very low and some were very high, then the others could be assumed to be average. Thus, it seemed better, if there was to be a residual category of cases who could not be classified, to have it in the middle of the scale than at either end. If it appeared in the course of analysis that categories in the middle of the scale could be clearly defined, then this would be fine. But the major effort would be made to define groups at either end.

c) Overlap Among Groups

Ideally, we would have found patterns of answers such that people would never fit more than one. But this was too much to hope for. We decided to place any case that was found in two groups with similar levels of job seeking in the first category that had been defined. Individuals who gave one pattern of answers associated with high levels of job seeking and another pattern associated with low levels would be declassified.

Placing people who fell into two groups with similar levels of job seeking in one group and excluding them from the other made it substantially harder to define categories than it would have been otherwise. To meet our standards for homogeneity, groups had to contain at least five members, more if their job seeking levels were not identical. Not allowing cases to be included in more than one group made it a good deal harder to define groups large enough to meet the criterion.

The Method of Classification

Having decided what kind of groups to look for, we developed a systematic method of locating them. The method consists of five

steps. When the five steps are completed, a new group has been defined. The set can be gone through as many times as necessary.

When a new group has been defined, the cases in this group are dropped from consideration. Thus, in each round of analysis, we are looking for questions that will define another group from among the cases not yet categorized. Let us go through the steps one by one.

1. In the first step, we tabulated levels of job seeking by a set of other questions that seemed likely to have a bearing on job seeking. For both the January cases and the longer-term cases, we used about twenty-five questions. From these tabulations, we selected the single question that gave the best division between those who were not looking for work at all, or those who had been looking five times or more, and the other cases.* If a single question defined a group of cases that were similar enough on job seeking to meet our standards, then Steps 2 to 4 were omitted. (In practice, this occurred only once. Ordinarily, we proceeded to Step 2.)
2. In Step 2, we would do a second tabulation of job seeking with the set of questions used in Step 1. This time, we would control for the item chosen in Step 1. Again, the question which gave the best division between those who were not looking for work at all, or who had been looking five times or more, and the other cases was selected. If the two questions selected at this stage defined a group that met our standards, Steps 3 and 4 were omitted. Otherwise, we went on to Step 3.

*The selection was largely done by inspection. Where a formal criterion seemed necessary to decide between two possibilities, the criterion was the chi-square value for a 2 x 2 table. It should be noted that this criterion became progressively less useful in later steps, primarily because of the numbers involved.

3. At this stage, we would look only at the cases whose answers to the questions chosen in Steps 1 and 2 suggested they might be pared down to form a homogeneous group. For this group of cases, we would do another tabulation of job seeking with the set of questions used in Steps 1 and 2. At this point, it was often possible to select a question that would define a group that met our criteria, or come very close to it. Sometimes it was necessary to choose from a number of possible questions. If so, the one that seemed to produce the most meaningful pattern of answers was selected. If three questions provided a satisfactory grouping of cases, we skipped to Step 5. Otherwise, we proceeded to Step 4.
4. This step was basically a repetition of Step 3. Only the cases whose answers to the questions selected in Steps 1 to 3 fitted the emerging pattern were considered. Another tabulation of job seeking with the set of questions used in Step 1 was done. Again, we looked for an item which would define a group meeting our criteria. If there was any choice in the matter, we selected the question that seemed to provide the most meaningful pattern of answers.

A group would often be defined at this stage. If necessary, we would repeat the procedure of Steps 3 and 4 until a satisfactory group had been established.

Towards the end of our analysis, when a number of groups had already been defined, it sometimes turned out that a satisfactory grouping could not be developed. In this case, we went back to Step 2, selected another question and proceeded through the following steps to see if, with a new second item, we could define a group. If not, we returned to Step 1 and repeated the entire series. This was continued until we were persuaded that

no more groups meeting our standards could be defined.*

5. When a group, other than the first, appeared to have been established, we tested the set of answers used to define it on the people who had already been placed in groups. If there was any overlap, the two groups with the overlapping cases were compared. If a question could be found which would meaningfully distinguish the two groups and which would tell us in which groups the overlapping cases should be placed, they were placed in the appropriate group. If this could not be done and if placing the overlapping cases in the first group defined reduced the size of the more recently formed group to the point where it no longer met our standards for homogeneity, the group was dropped. In this case, we returned to Step 2 or 3 and worked through the succeeding steps to see if another group could be defined which would not overlap so greatly. Had this failed, we would have returned to Step 1. In practice, this did not occur.

Some readers may wonder how important a role a researcher's judgement plays in the process. If one criterion for selecting questions in the latter stages is how meaningfully they seem to combine with others, perhaps different researchers would get different results. There is no very simple answer to this question. It should be noted, though, that the influence of judgement was limited to Step 3 and the following steps. It should also be noted that the data and our homogeneity requirements placed sharp limits on the items that could be used. For example, among the shorter-term cases, to get seven satisfactory

*Theoretically, we could have simply returned to Step 3 instead of going all the way back to Step 2. In the later stages of analysis, when this was done, it seemed clear from the data that something more basic than the third question in the set needed to be changed.

groups, we had to try more than thirty different patterns. Thus, while different people might get rather different results from the same data, it would appear to the writer that the results would likely be quite similar for different researchers.

But in any case, the test of any research procedure is what it will explain. Let us see what we have been able to do with our data. For convenience, we will treat the January cases and the longer-term cases separately. For each of the samples, we will present the groups who are looking for work hardest first, then the groups who are looking for work least. It should be noted that, in this analysis, the longer-term cases were not weighted. That is, we are working directly from the cases, and not making inferences about the broader population from which they were drawn. It should also be noted that the cases are not presented in the order in which they were defined, but rather in an order which is convenient for laying out our findings.

Job Seeking Categories for the Short-term Cases

As we mentioned above, we have defined seven groups among the short-term cases. Four had low levels of job seeking. Three were much higher. Let us begin with the latter.

Short-Term Cases - Group One

The first group was defined with just two questions. They had grown up outside Ontario and they rarely or never drank alcohol. (Six out of the seven never did.)

The reader will recall that those from outside Ontario had generally looked for work harder than those who had grown up in Ontario. If we eliminate those who drank alcohol more often, we are left with a group of seven people. Five of them had been looking for work ten to fourteen times in the preceding two weeks. One had been looking five to nine times and the other had looked more than fifteen times.

In terms of their other answers, it would seem that the group could very well be described as in-migrant puritans. None

of them ever used marijuana or strong drugs. Six out of seven went to church (less than one-quarter of the January cases ever went to church). Six out of seven said that they tried to make sure that the things they did were in good taste.

Now one of the classic puritan virtues is hard work. Their answers to other questions suggest that they attached real importance to work. All seven said they were dissatisfied with their situation on welfare. Six out of seven said that the most important thing in their lives was to get a job. (The seventh might well have said the same, if she had not been planning her wedding.) All five of those who were interviewed on the second round said that they had had a hard time in life so far and they were trying to make their future better. All of them said that they believed in planning ahead for the future, and all of them said that they were interested in taking more education.

Altogether then, it is not difficult to see why this group were among those who looked for work most often. The same is true of our second group, although the defining characteristics of the two groups are quite distinct.

Short-Term Cases - Group Two

The defining characteristics of the second group are rather complex. All had grown up in Hamilton. None of their families had ever been on welfare. All agreed fully with the statement, "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things." All agreed with the statements, "I try to make sure the things I do are in good taste", and "I make plans and follow them." None of them drank alcohol frequently.

When we look at the answers given to other questions, this complexity sorts itself out quite well.

None of their families had ever been on welfare. Members of this group had been supporting themselves in blue collar jobs until quite recently. Clearly, the shift from working to welfare

was very disagreeable. Nine out of ten were so unhappy with the situation that we coded their responses to our question about how satisfied they were with their lives or what would make them happier as "depressed". Not surprisingly, nine out of ten also said the most important thing in their lives was getting a job, or that the one thing that would make them happier would be a job.

Along with a clear dislike for being on welfare went two characteristics - self-control and vitality. Vitality was shown in their unqualified agreement with the statement, "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things." It was also shown in the unqualified agreement of all but one or two of them with the statements, "I like to work out new ways of doing things", "I like to hear about new ideas", and "I have a lively imagination." A certain ambition might be seen in the fact that all wanted to get further job training at a later date. Those who found work before the second interview were still interested in it. Ambition might also be seen in the agreement of all those we talked to on the second round of interviews that they had had a hard time in life so far and were working for a better life in the future.

Combined with these signs of vitality, there were clear signs of self-discipline. The defining characteristics for the group included an interest in being in good taste and an ability to make plans and follow them. All members of the group also used alcohol less than "frequently".

Now a combination of dislike for welfare, vitality and a substantial amount of self-control would seem likely to produce someone who would be trying hard to get work. It did. Of the ten people in this category, eight had been out looking for work five to nine times in the preceding week. One had been out ten to fourteen times. The last had been out more than fifteen times.

In some ways, this group is similar to the last of the groups with a high level of job seeking. The final group also shows a high degree of self-restraint.

Short-Term Cases - Group Three

This third group is defined by a set of five characteristics. All were female. All agreed with the statement, "I make plans and follow them." None expressed any anxiety over her ability to do things people asked of her or expected of her. These three characteristics basically define the category. The last two characteristics were used to rule out cases which seemed to fit better in other categories. One of these criteria was agreement with the statement, "I find it hard to understand perfectionists." The other was agreement (or at least not disagreement) with the statement, "I often act impulsively." These two items, taken together, had the effect of screening out people who appeared to be more self-controlled than the others in this category.

The answers to some other questions will help to clarify the meaning of the defining characteristics. All five of the people in this category had gone past Grade 10. None had left school because of failure. All five wanted to get more training at a future date. All had had stable employment records. Most had had only one job since leaving high school and none had had more than two. None had left her last job because of being fired. Altogether, these young women sound like the sort of people in whom we would expect to find little anxiety about their abilities.

Self-confidence in social relations seemed a natural outcome of their lives to date. In the answers to open-ended questions at the end of the interview, all mentioned some positive relations in the present. Four out of five had friends in, and went out visiting, at least once a week. Four out of five mentioned positive relations with other people as the most rewarding thing

in their lives so far. (All had come from families of at least four.) Only one in five mentioned any negative relationships in either the past or the present. So it would be expected that the young women in this group would have a basic confidence in their ability to relate to others.

Combined with self-confidence, there were greater signs of self-discipline or of self-restraint than we found in most of the people we talked to. All said that they made plans and followed them. All said that they tried to be sure that what they did was in good taste. None had ever used either hard or soft drugs, and none used alcohol frequently. Four out five described themselves as cautious people.

Now, if someone is confident about her abilities, gets along well with people, displays the ability to make plans and stick to them, is careful about good taste in her behaviour, and has gone to Grade 11 or farther, she has a good deal going for her in the labour market that many other people we talked to did not have. She also might be expected to find it easier to approach employers than others would. So perhaps it is not surprising that of the five people in this category, three had been looking for work ten to fourteen times, one five to nine times, and the other fifteen times or more.

The last two groups we have seen had something in common. But there are quite clear differences between the groups with a high level of job seeking and those with a lower level. Let us turn now to the groups where job seeking was at a low level.

Short-Term Cases - Group Four

The first group of low levels of job seeking is also the least active. None of the seven people in the group had looked for work in the preceding two weeks.

Five characteristics were used to define the group. All

of them expressed contentment with their situations and said they liked to live day by day. None mentioned getting a job as an important thing for their future. None expressed any resentment towards the way life had been so far. None had any negative relations in the present.

It appears that members of this group, in the phrase of the day, were simply "hanging loose". All said they were living day by day. Five out of seven disagreed with the statement, "I make plans and follow them." All said they were content with their situation.

They had active social lives. All had friends in, and went out to visit, at least once a week. None mentioned any negative relations in the present.

Nor did they seem to have a great deal of drive. Five out of seven agreed with the statement, "I don't often feel like taking on new responsibilities." As we have seen, none mentioned getting a job as a major goal for the future.

Someone who is content with his situation on welfare, who lives day by day, and who does not express a desire for work would not seem likely to look for work very often.

Short-Term Cases - Group Five

The next group was composed of young men who had just dropped out of school. All were seventeen or less. None had completed more than elementary school, or a special program for slow learners. All came from families which had been on welfare for at least six months inside of the last five years.

Apart from these defining characteristics, the members of the group had a number of other things in common. It should not be too surprising, for example, in view of their difficulties in school, that most said they sometimes worried about their ability to do the things people expected them to do or asked them to do. Nor should it be too surprising, in view of their age and

apparent slow learning, that all said they lived from day to day rather than planning for the future. Since their families had been on welfare, and since they had never done well enough in school to build up any very great hopes for the future, it is not too surprising that all but one said that, if he was not fully content with life, at least he was getting along all right. One other thing they seemed to hold in common was a lack of trust for other people. Six out of seven said there was really no one, except sometimes their parents, they felt that they could fully count on.

A pattern emerges that would certainly not lead us to expect a high level of job seeking. The family had been on welfare. The respondent was not confident about his own ability, and had no marketable skills. He said he lived from day to day and felt he was getting along all right as things stood. Our interviewers said of some of them that they appeared to have very little idea of how difficult a situation they were in, or of how to go about finding a job.

Altogether, it seems understandable that the group should have a low level of job seeking. Four had not been out to look for work at all in the preceding two weeks, one had been out once and the other two had been out twice.

This group had a low level of education in common with our next group. The next group differs, however, in being all female. This results in some other differences.

Short-Term Cases - Group Six

The defining characteristics for the group are as follows. All were female. None mentioned employment as a hope for the future. All wanted to get married. All said the most satisfying things in their lives so far had been relationships with other people, ordinarily, boyfriends. One further criterion was used

to distinguish people in this group from those in another. This was that no one should give more than one response to the open-ended question at the end of the interview that showed confidence in her own abilities.

From the defining characteristics of the group, and from the few other questions to which they gave similar answers, it appears that this group was strongly oriented to marriage and not particularly interested in employment. None had finished high school. None mentioned a job as a major hope for the future. At the same time, the most important things in their past had been human relations and all wanted to get married. This does not sound like the kind of orientation that would result in a high level of job seeking. It was not. Four of the six had not been looking for work in the last two weeks. The other two had been out twice each.

Short-Term Cases - Group Seven

The last of the groups defined among the short-term cases is understandable from two basic themes - contentment with life in the present, and more than occasional consumption of alcohol.

Other questions on which the group gave similar answers were few. But as we might have guessed from the connections mentioned in Chapter 4 between contentment and a vigorous social life, this group did have an active social life. All ten had friends in and went out to visit at least once a week, ordinarily more often.

All but one said there were jobs he would not take and could name a variety. Of those we talked to on the second round, all four said that they liked a way of life that was described as follows:

"I enjoy the simple pleasures of life, such as comfortable surroundings, good food, relaxation and just being alive. I almost always try to be at ease, calm and carefree with no driving ambitions."

A liking for this way of life would seem to tie in with their basic satisfaction with life on welfare.

All told then, it would appear that this group had a low level of job seeking because they were content with life, and were having a good time while on welfare. On the average, they went out to look for work once. Two had been out this often. Four others had not looked at all. The remaining four had looked twice.

The seven categories we have defined contain fifty-two cases. We are left with a residual category of thirty. Three of the twenty-two who had not been looking for work at all could not be placed in one of the categories we were able to define and ended up in the residual category. Six of the twenty-eight who had been looking for work more than five times also fell into the residual group. But the bulk of the residual category fell in between. Nineteen of the thirty had been looking one to four times.

It seems, then, that we have met with considerable success in explaining the variation in job seeking for the January cases. A formal test can be made by predicting that members of each category, including the residual category, will display the mean level of job seeking for their group. This prediction can then be tested against actual levels of job seeking. The test shows that we have explained seventy-three per cent of the variance.

We were able to do somewhat better with the longer-term cases. With nine categories, we were able to explain eighty-two per cent of the variance. Let us look at the categories that were able to provide this explanation.

First, the categories in which people were looking hardest for work. There are five of these.

Longer-Term Cases - Group One

The first group has eight defining characteristics. All had taken a technical or vocational course in school. All wanted further job training. All said they were impulsive, that they always found it easy to find something to do, and that they found it hard to understand perfectionists. All expressed optimism about the future. Two other characteristics were added to distinguish members of this group from members of others. One was that each respondent had to give at least one indication of negative mood - ordinarily, an indication of dissatisfaction was being on welfare. The second was that no one mentioned human relations as the most meaningful things in his past.

Although the defining characteristics were complex, the answers given on other questions produce a coherent pattern. Perhaps the clearest element in the pattern is the impression of energy or vitality that the people in this group gave. We have seen that all said they were impulsive and they found it easy to find things to do. Six out of seven agreed, without qualification, to the statement, "I like to hear about new ideas." Five out of seven agreed, without qualification, with the statements, "I have an active imagination" and "I like to work out new ways of doing things". Of those who were interviewed on the second round, all said they very much liked the way of life described as follows:

"I enjoy life as much as I possibly can, and let myself go. I don't spend too much time on any one thing because there are so many experiences to enjoy. I avoid strong attachments to other people. I enjoy a lively social time but need some time to myself."

Now people with this approach to life, if they wanted to find work, might well be expected to go after it energetically. As it happened, they did, and most had specific types of work to look for. Further, the people around them wanted them to find work. In all but one case, friends had suggested places where a

job might be found. Their parents, in all but one case, were unhappy about their being on welfare.

Altogether then, their job seeking efforts make sense. As a group, they showed an unusual amount of vitality. They wanted work and the people around them wanted it for them. So it is not too surprising that, among this group, four had been out looking for work five to nine times, and the other had been out to look ten to fourteen times.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Two

The next group shared some of the vitality of the first, and added a strong dislike for being on welfare. The group had eight defining characteristics. All were male. All came from families where the father held a blue collar occupation. All had been in Hamilton two years or more. All mentioned getting a job as one of the important things in his future. All agreed with the statement, "I like to work out new ways of doing things." None expressed any uncertainty about his future. The final two characteristics were added to cut out cases that did not seem to fit well with the others. One was that none should have said that a particular achievement was the most satisfying thing in his past. The other was that none should fully agree with the statement, "I have a lively imagination."

The reader may have noticed that three of the defining characteristics were simply matters of background. All were male. All had been in Hamilton at least two years. All came from blue collar families. But why should people who fit this description be looking harder for work than others? As with so many of our other groups, the answers to questions apart from those that define the group will clarify the matter.

The desire for a job, which was among the defining characteristics, is reinforced by the dislike for being on welfare. Six out of seven expressed dissatisfaction with their life on welfare.

Five out of seven were sufficiently unhappy about it that we coded them as "depressed". All of those interviewed on the second round said that, even apart from the income difference, it was worse to be on welfare than to be working. All seven said their parents were unhappy about their being on welfare.

A strong preference for working was supported by a good degree of vitality. We have seen that one of the defining characteristics was an enjoyment of new ideas. All seven also agreed that they liked to work out new ways of doing things. Six of the seven agreed with the statement, "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things". Five of the seven agreed that they were often impulsive. Of those we interviewed on the second round, four out of five said they liked a way of life described as follows:

"I am constantly active and adventurous. I never sit around. I try to find practical solutions to problems. My future depends mostly on what I do, not what I think or feel."

These signs of vitality were combined with some indications of a basic self-discipline. None used alcohol frequently. None ever used marijuana or strong drugs. Five of seven agreed fully with the statement, "I try to make sure the things I do are in good taste."

Now if someone combines a clear desire to get off welfare with a high degree of vitality and a basic level of self-control, it makes sense to expect him to be looking for work harder than most of the people we talked to. Of the seven people in this group, five had looked for work between ten and fourteen times. One had looked between five and nine times. The last had looked more than fifteen times.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Three

The third category, like the second, uses a series of background factors as defining characteristics. No one in the group

had completed high school. All came from families in which the father's job status was in the lowest of the seven categories we have been using, or in which the family had been on welfare. Four other characteristics were used as well. Everyone in the group said that the minimum income he would work for was at least \$70 a week. Everyone was prepared to say that there were jobs he was unwilling to take. The two final characteristics used were used to cut out cases that overlapped other groups or in other respects did not seem to fit well. The first of these was that friends should not have suggested places to look for work more than once or twice. The second was that no one in the category should disagree with the statement, "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things."

The first thing that is clear about this group is its relatively low social status. Fathers are in the lowest occupational category or the family has been on welfare. The people in the group have not completed high school and none have held a job above category six on our occupational status scale. Now there is certainly little money in their background and they could all name jobs they would not take. This might lead us to wonder whether this type of person would be relatively uninterested in getting off welfare. They were not used to much money, and perhaps they were being choosy about the jobs they would take.

But it is often said that it is just the people who are at the bottom end of the social ladder, but not on welfare, who make it most a matter of principle not to go on welfare. That their families took this view might be suggested by the fact that six out of seven said their parents were disappointed about their being on welfare. Our respondents were unhappy about it too. Of those we interviewed on the second round, all said that, apart from the income, it was better to be working than on welfare. They wanted to be doing something or to be productive. All of them said that they very much liked the way of life described in the following statement:

"I like to use my hands to make things. I enjoy physical activities such as sports. I get satisfaction from solving a challenging problem."

All said they disliked the way of life described in the following statement:

"I live in my own world of ideals. I'm very sensitive. The outside world is too big and full of pressures. I realize that aggressive action is of little use."

In short, they wanted to be active, to be doing something, not, as they would think of it, "just sitting around".

There were other signs of energy as well. Seven of eight agreed with the statement, "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things." Six out of eight said that they had active imaginations. All eight agreed with the statement, "I like to hear about new ideas."

The only other thing with which all eight agreed was that everyone accepted the statement, "I am a cautious person." It may be that this trait lies behind their ability to think of jobs they would not be willing to take. They may very well have thought about the matter and decided that there simply were a number of things they would not be happy doing. This interpretation is strengthened by the responses we got when we asked people on the second interview whether they would take a series of jobs if they were offered. Five of these jobs were at the minimum wage. Four out of five people said they would take at least four of these. So in light of this, and their desire to be active, a degree of caution seems a better explanation for their rejection for some types of work than the possibility that they are just being overly choosy.

We have seen that, in some other groups in which people expressed a dislike for being on welfare and, at the same time, showed a high degree of vitality, everyone was looking for work more actively than average. The same was true for this group.

Of the eight people, four had been looking five to nine times, two had looked four times, and the last two had looked ten to fourteen times.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Four

The fourth group consists of seven cases. Of these, five had been looking for work ten to fourteen times. The other two had been out five to nine times. The group was defined by nine characteristics. Eight could be fitted into three sets. The first set had to do with the family. All of these people wanted to marry. All came from families with five or more children. All had left home after leaving school and were living on their own. All of their parents were disappointed at their being on welfare. The second set had to do with their views of their situation. All were dissatisfied with their life on welfare. All mentioned getting a job as a basic hope for the future. The third set has to do with what might be called conventionality. All agreed with the statement, "I try to make sure the things I do are in good taste." All agreed with the statement, "I try to do things in a conventional way." The final characteristic, not fitting with the other sets, was that all of their most recent jobs had been at level five or lower on the social status scale we are using.

Perhaps the main impression this group gives is one of conventionality. Not only did all of them want to be married, but six of seven gave "romantic involvement" as a major reason for wanting to marry. Not only were they dissatisfied with being on welfare, but their parents were disappointed about it as well. Everyone mentioned getting a job as a major hope for the future. Now wanting to marry and wanting to work are very basic traditional values in our society. To round out the picture, everyone in the group agreed with statements indicating their interest in doing things in good taste and in trying to do

things conventionally. Probably many of the others would have referred to those in this group as "super straights". In line with their basically traditional values, these people were looking hard for work.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Five

The last group who were looking hard for work also showed a clear pattern of values, but of a rather different kind. The group is defined by a set of ten characteristics. Two of these are background factors. All were between eighteen and twenty-one, and none had finished high school. Others were matters of personality or mood. All of them agreed, or at least did not disagree, with the statement, "I make plans and follow them." All of them disagreed, or at least did not agree, with the statement, "I don't often feel like taking on new responsibilities." All said they were very unhappy about being on welfare. None gave any indication that there was anyone else he could fully trust. Two other characteristics in this group were basically used to screen out a few cases that did not quite seem to fit otherwise. None in the group had disagreed fully with either the statement, "I try to live in a conventional way", or "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things." That is, the people in this group might not be highly conventional or enthusiastic, but neither could they rate themselves at the opposite extreme. The final two characteristics were that the respondent either did not know what his parents thought about being on welfare or reported that they were disappointed about it, and that no one expressed the attitude that he did not care what other people thought about his situation.

Perhaps the thing that stands out about this group, as distinct from others, is a kind of individualism. One of the defining characteristics of the group was that no one said there was anyone he could fully trust. Six of seven said the opposite.

When we asked them about important things in their lives in the present, only one mentioned any other person. Of those we talked to on the second round, all four said they liked the way of life described as follows:

"I like to be alone, live in a private place, and have lots of time to myself. I try to understand myself and I avoid depending on other people."

But their individualism was not just of the navel-gazing variety. We have seen that everyone in the group agreed, or did not disagree, with the statement, "I make plans and follow them." They also disagreed, or at least did not agree, with the statement, "I don't often feel like taking on new responsibilities." Of those we interviewed in the second round, all said they liked the way of life described as follows:

"I like to use my hands to make things. I enjoy physical activity such as sports. I get satisfaction from solving a challenging problem."

It would seem, then, that their individualism represented a dislike of being dependent, or a preference for being in control of their lives. It is understandable that someone with this view of life would prefer to be off welfare and would be actively looking for work. Four had been out to look for it five to nine times. One had been out ten to fourteen times. The last had been out more than fifteen times.

This completes our set of actively looking groups. Now we must turn to the groups at the opposite end of the scale.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Six

The first of the low looking groups was very easily defined. Everyone in it was either pregnant or the single mother of a pre-school child. There were eight people in the group. There were

other single mothers, but the others said that they were not interested in working at the present time, so we have left them out of this analysis. All of those in the group said they disliked being on welfare, and had a specific type of work they would like. They seemed to be saying, in effect, that working was a possibility for them but it would have to be the right kind of work, and, if they could not get it, they would stay at home with their child. None had been looking for work in the past two weeks.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Seven

The second group was also all female. Two other characteristics were used to define the group. All said their parents were indifferent to their being on welfare. None disagreed fully with the statement, "I often find it hard to think of something I feel like doing."

The fact that most agreed with the latter statement, and none disagreed with it fully, gives one clue to the nature of the group. Although two-fifths of the people we talked to fully agreed with the statement, "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things", no one in this group did. All of those we talked to on the second round said they had left school because they were bored, or could not hack it. All of them said that they felt depressed. Taking all this into consideration, it would appear that people in this group were lacking in the kind of vitality we have seen among many of the hard looking groups.

Another noticeable characteristic of the group lies in their backgrounds. Four-fifths came from families that had been on welfare. All said their parents were indifferent to their being on welfare. Four-fifths said their friends had never suggested places to look for work. So not only were they relatively low on vitality, but there was little impetus from those around them to look for work.

Altogether then, it should not be too surprising that this group showed a low level of job seeking. None had been looking at all in the preceding two weeks.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Eight

The third group who were not looking very hard was all male. Many of the other defining characteristics were matters of background. All were between twenty and twenty-four. All had been in Hamilton less than five years, but none had left home in order to find work. All had been living by themselves. The other characteristics were matters of personality or mood. None agreed fully with the statement, "I like to work out new ways of doing things." All made some statement coded "depressed". None spoke of any negative relations in the present.

This group, like the one above, showed signs of a lack of vitality. Four out of five said the statement, "I become enthusiastic about a lot of things", was false. Four out of five agreed with the statement, "I often find it hard to think of something I feel like doing." As we have seen above, none agreed fully with the statement, "I like to work out new ways of doing things." All said they felt depressed.

There were also some signs of a lack of self-discipline. All said the statement, "I make plans and follow them" was false. Four-fifths used marijuana. Three-fifths said that they used stronger drugs more often than rarely.

Now if a person is low both on vitality and self-discipline, it should not be too surprising if he does not look for work very often. None of the people in this group had gone out to look in the two weeks before the first interview.

Longer-Term Cases - Group Nine

The final group has something in common with one of the groups among the short-term cases. Everyone in this group said

that he was content with his situation, and that he drank alcohol more often than occasionally. The other defining characteristics differed from those of the short-term group. All gave some indication of not trusting other people. All had completed elementary school. None had had more than two jobs in the last two years.

Like the comparable group who had been on welfare for only a short time, this group was very interested in social life. On the second interview, we interviewed four of the five in the group. We asked them to rank, in order of importance to them, the following things: friends, education, income, leisure and work. All four placed friends at the top of the list. Only one placed work as high as second.

Their friends were not very inclined to be helpful to them in finding work. Four-fifths said their friends had never suggested places to look.

As we have noted, everyone in the group said that he was content with his situation. This may have reflected the fact that all had come from families that had been on welfare. Only one had a specific type of work he was looking for. As we have seen, work was not at the top of their list of priorities.

It would seem, then, that this group, like one of the short-term groups, was more interested in having a good time in their social life than in getting off welfare. So the fact that none of them looked for work in the past two weeks would seem to fit with their views of life.

The nine groups defined among the longer-term cases included fifty-eight cases from the one hundred three to whom this analysis could be applied. Twenty-three of the thirty-five who had not been looking for work at all could be placed in a category. Thirty-one of the thirty-three who had looked for work more than five times could be placed in a category. As we have noted earlier, the categories we have defined will

explain eighty-two per cent of the variance in job seeking among the cases to which it was applied.

* * * * *

We are aware of no previous studies in which an attempt has been made to predict job seeking levels. It appears, then, that explaining so much of the variance represents a considerable advance. But the point of looking for work is to find it. How far will our understanding of job seeking carry us in understanding who gets work and who does not? Success and failure in finding work will be discussed in Chapter 6.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 6 - FINDING WORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Correlations With Job Finding	6-1
- Personal Background	6-2
- Employment History	6-5
- Personality Characteristics	6-8
- Plans for the Future	6-9
- Job Seeking	6-10
- Summary of Correlations	6-13
Predicting Job Finding	6-14
- Accuracy of Prediction	6-17

CHAPTER 6FINDING WORK

In this chapter, we will review our data on success and failure in finding work. In the first part of the chapter, we will review the relationships between finding work and other things we asked about. In the latter portion, we will describe our efforts to find a method of predicting whether a person would find work or not.

About twenty of the people in each of our samples went off welfare without our knowing whether they had found work. Data from the first round of interviews is based on seventy cases from the January sample and one hundred one from the longer-term sample. Data from the second round of interviews is based on fifty-one cases from the January sample, and sixty-eight cases from the longer-term sample. The sub-samples within the longer-term group have been weighted in the first section of the chapter, but not in the second.

CORRELATIONS WITH JOB FINDING

As we pointed out in Chapter 1, we wanted to relate almost every question we asked to success or failure in finding work. We cannot report all of the results. As in Chapter 5, we will limit ourselves to associations which are strong enough that they would arise by chance less than once in twenty occasions. If an association is mentioned here, but is said not to be statistically significant, then it was too weak to meet this criterion. If a question is not mentioned here, the reader may assume that its relationship with finding work was not strong enough to be mentioned.*

The questions associated with job finding will be presented under five headings:

*There are three exceptions, but these associations appear quite clearly to result from intervening variables.

1. Personal Background
2. Employment History
3. Personality Characteristics
4. Plans for the Future
5. Job Seeking

1. Personal Background

Under this heading, there are six questions that were associated with finding work:- age, the size of the family the respondent grew up in, why he left school, whether his parents encouraged him to stay in school at the time he left, and whether his parents had ever been on welfare.

Age

Those who were older were more likely to find work. The trend for the January cases is shown in Table 6-1.

TABLE 6-1

Success in Finding Work, by Age, for January Cases,
in Percentages

<u>Age</u>	<u>Those Find- ing Work</u>	<u>Those Not Finding Work</u>	<u>Total</u>
16,17	19	81	100 (n=16)
18	33	67	100 (n=16)
19-21	45	55	100 (n=22)
22-25	56	44	100 (n=16)
Total	38	62	100 (n=70)

Among the sixteen and seventeen year olds, less than one in five found work over the course of the study, that is, by the end of April, 1972. The figure rises with age, until more than half of those who were twenty-two or over had found work. The trend ran in the same direction among the longer-term cases, but was not statistically significant. For both groups, the proportion who found jobs rose to the age of eighteen. Among the January cases, it continued to rise, but among the longer-term cases, it did not. Why it continued to rise for one group and not for the other is quite unclear. But at least the two samples showed a similar trend at the lower end of the age range.

Family Size

A greater difference between the short-term and longer-term cases appeared on the number of people in the respondent's family. There was no appreciable association between job finding and family size among the short-term cases. Among the longer-term cases, there was. Forty-nine per cent of those who got jobs came from families of six or more. Only thirteen per cent of those who did not get jobs came from families this large. Why the two samples should differ on this question is quite unclear. In any case, the absence of an association among the January cases does call the generality of the finding into some question.

Education

The association between education and finding work was statistically significant in both samples. Table 6-2 shows the relationship for the January cases. Among those who had less than a complete elementary education, only one of eight got a job. The figure rises regularly with education. At the top of the scale, among those who had finished high school, two-thirds found work.

The trend among the longer-term cases is partly masked by the fact that the females were less likely to be at the bottom of

the educational scale than the males, but were also less active in looking for work. If we control for sex, the relationship between education and finding work is almost as strong as it is among the January cases.

TABLE 6-2

Success in Finding Work, by Education, for January Cases,
in Percentages

<u>Education</u>	<u>Those Find- ing Work</u>	<u>Those Not Finding Work</u>	<u>Total</u>
Less than elementary completed	13	87	100 (n=8)
Elementary com- plete, Grade 10 not complete	28	72	100 (n=21)
Grade 10 com- plete, secondary not complete	38	62	100 (n=26)
Secondary com- plete	67	33	100 (n=15)
Total	38	62	100 (n=70)

Reasons for Leaving School

Reasons for leaving school are also associated with job finding in each of our samples. Among the January cases, only twenty per cent of those who got jobs said they had left school because they were bored, could not hack it, or could not get along with the teachers. Among those who did not get jobs, more than one-half gave at least one of these reasons. Among the longer-term cases,

one-fifth of those who got jobs said they left because they were bored, or could not hack it. Two-fifths of those who could not get jobs said this.

But there appears to be an intervening variable. We pointed out in Chapter 4 that those who had not completed high school were more likely to have left for reasons of this kind than those who had finished. If we remove those who completed high school from the analysis, the difference between those who found work and those who did not is no longer statistically significant.

Encouragement to Stay in School

The same thing happens with parental encouragement to stay in school. Those who were most strongly encouraged were least likely to find work. But, as we have pointed out in Chapter 4, those who left school before the end of Grade 12 were more likely to receive encouragement. Once again, it appears to be the level of education that makes the difference.

Parents on Welfare

The last of the background factors associated with job finding was whether or not the parents had been on welfare. Among the January cases, nineteen per cent of those whose parents had been on welfare got jobs. Forty-two per cent of those whose parents had not been on welfare found work. Among the longer-term cases, there was no appreciable difference between those whose parents had been on welfare and those whose parents had not. Why the samples should differ in this respect is unclear. But, in any case, the absence of a relationship among the longer-term cases calls the generality of the finding into some question.

2. Employment History

Under this heading, four questions are associated with job finding:- whether the respondent had had a full-time job in the last

two years, the census category of his most recent job, the occupational status score of his most recent job, and the reason why he left his most recent job. Let us look at each in turn.

Holding a Full-time Job

For both the January cases and the longer-term cases, the relationship between holding a job in the past two years and finding work was strong enough that it would not have arisen by chance more than once in twenty occasions. Among the January cases, only eight per cent of those who found work had not had a job in the last two years. Twenty-nine per cent of those who did not get work had not had a job in that period. Among the longer-term cases, the relationship was masked by differences among our sub-samples. But, controlling for sample differences, we obtained a trend in the same direction and of about the same strength. So recent job experience seems to be related to finding a new job after a time on welfare.

Census Categories

Among the January cases, but not among the longer-term cases, people whose most recent jobs had been in two broad census categories did better than those whose experience had been in other fields. Of those who had been in the categories "Clerical and Sales" or "Craftsmen, Production Process and Related Workers", fifty-seven per cent found work. Of those who had been in other fields, thirty-two per cent found work. This type of difference did not arise, however, among the longer-term cases. Since the samples did not give the same results, perhaps the difference between these two census categories and others may not be fundamental.*

*Another consideration is that the numbers are relatively small. We have data on previous occupations for only fifty-six of the January cases.

Occupational Status Scores

What seems to be involved is that some of the jobs in these categories score better than many of the others people had had on occupational status. There is an association between previous occupational status and job finding for both the January cases and the longer-term cases. Among the short-term sample, thirteen of the eighteen people who had been in status categories 2 to 4 found work.* Only sixteen of the forty-two who had been in lower categories found it. Among the longer-term cases, sixty-eight per cent of those who did not find work, and for whom we have occupational data,** had been in categories 6 and 7. Only forty-four per cent of those who found work had been this low on the scale. It appears clear, then, that having held a relatively high status position before was a factor in finding work.

Reasons for Leaving the Most Recent Job

The last factor in employment history that made a difference in finding work was the reason why the respondent had left his most recent job. Among the longer-term cases, those who had been fired or laid off were less likely to get work. Only fourteen per cent of those who were fired or laid off got jobs. Forty-four per cent of the others did.*** There was no appreciable difference between those who were fired or laid off and others among the January cases. Why being fired or laid off should make a difference in one sample but not the other is unclear. But the difference between the two groups does raise the question as to how important the reasons for which people left their most recent job actually were.

* No one had been in category 1.

** We have occupational data on eighty-two of the longer-term cases.

***It might be suggested that this was because those who had been laid off were simply waiting to be called back. It seems unlikely in view of the fact that they reported levels of job seeking similar to those of other people in the sample.

3. Personality Characteristics

Differences between the January cases and the longer-term cases appear regularly on personality characteristics. Of the questions under this heading that showed an association with job seeking, all five showed a significant association for the longer-term cases but not for the short-term cases. Now, ordinarily, when one sample shows an association and the other does not, we have suggested that the findings should be treated with caution. Perhaps the same should be done here. On the other hand, the fact that there are five questions, all in the same general field, associated with job seeking for the longer-term cases but not for the short-term cases may mean that, for some reason, personality characteristics were more important among the longer-term cases. We do not know. However this may be, let us look at the results.

In three of the questions, people were asked to react to a statement. In the first case, they were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement, "I like to hear about new ideas." Ninety-two per cent of those who found work agreed. Only seventy-seven per cent of those who did not find it agreed.

In two other cases, people were asked how much they liked different ways of living. The first of these was described as follows:

"I am constantly active and adventurous. I never sit around. I try to find practical solutions to problems. My future depends mostly on what I do, not what I think or feel."

Ninety-five per cent of those who got jobs said they liked this way of living. Only sixty-seven per cent of those who did not get jobs liked it.

The second way of living was described as follows:

"I like to be open to others, helping when I can. I'm affectionate and sympathetic to others."

Among those who got jobs, fifty-four per cent liked this. Among those who did not, eighty-two per cent liked it. On one of the other questions, we received responses that seem to be related.

Reactions to the statement, "These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on", often showed a lack of trust in other people. Both on the first round and the second round, expressions of distrust were associated with finding work. Among those who got jobs, eighty-nine per cent expressed distrust on the first round, and eighty-one per cent on the second. Among those who did not find jobs, seventy-one per cent expressed distrust on the first round, and forty-eight per cent on the second.

Now expressing distrust is associated with finding work, and liking a way of life involving openness, affection and sympathy is associated with not finding work. This would seem to suggest that, in some way, being too involved with others or not being independent enough, works against finding work.

The last personality factor associated with job finding was the presence or absence of answers showing resentment about the past among responses to the open-ended questions at the end of the interview. Twenty-nine per cent of those who got jobs expressed this. Forty-five per cent of those who did not expressed it. Perhaps this was because complaining about not having gotten the best breaks is less common among those who are actually trying to better their situation.

4. Plans for the Future

Only two questions on plans for the future were associated with job finding. One of these was, "What do you plan to do over the next six months?" Those who said they had no real plans or that they planned to stay on welfare were less likely to find work than others, among either the longer-term cases or the short-term cases. Among the longer-term cases, none of the fifteen who gave

one of these answers found work. More than a third of those who gave other answers found it. Among the short-term cases, the trend was not quite strong enough to be statistically significant. But the near significant relationship would tend to support the idea that having no plans for the next six months or expecting to stay on welfare was connected to not finding work.

The other question that made a difference was, "Do you have any plans to leave Hamilton?" Among the January cases, too few were thinking of leaving for a very meaningful analysis. Among the longer-term cases, thirty-nine per cent of those who got jobs said they were planning to leave, or that they might do so. Only sixteen per cent of those who did not get jobs were thinking of leaving. It seems that many of those who spoke of leaving meant that, if they could not find work here, or got to the point where it looked as though they could not, they would go somewhere else. In this sense, thinking of leaving was a sign of interest in finding a job.

5. Job Seeking

Of the questions we asked about job seeking, four were related to finding work:- whether people were looking for a specific kind of work, the number of times they had gone out looking for work in the last two weeks, the number of firms they had contacted, and the type of firms they had contacted. Let us look at each in turn.

Looking for Specific Types of Work

Among the January cases, looking for specific types of work was associated with success in finding work. Among those who found work, eighty-five per cent had been looking for something specific. Among those who did not, only fifty-one per cent had had something specific in mind. There was no appreciable difference between those who had something specific in mind and those who did not among the longer-term cases. We do not know why there should be a difference in one sample and not in the other.

Frequency of Job Seeking

Among both the January cases and the longer-term cases, the number of times the respondent had gone out to look for work in the last two weeks was associated with job finding. The data for the January cases are shown in Table 6-3.

TABLE 6-3

Success in Finding Work, by Frequency of Looking for Work
in the Preceding Two Weeks, for January Cases,
in Percentages

<u>Frequency of Looking</u>	<u>Those Find- ing Work</u>	<u>Those Not Finding Work</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	26	26	26
1 - 4	17	49	37
5 or more	<u>57</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>37</u>
Total	100 (n=23)	101* (n=39)	100 (n=62)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Among those who found work, over half looked more than five times in the two weeks before the interview. Among those who did not find work, just over one-quarter looked this hard. The other entries in the table may cause some puzzlement. We would expect those who did not look for work in the preceding two weeks to be less likely to find it than those who looked one to four times. This was not the case. It seems to have resulted from the fact that a good many people with a complete high school education had not been looking at all. When they did begin to look, their chances were much better than those of other people.

Among the longer-term cases, the trend was not confused by an intervening variable. But it was weaker. Among the longer-term cases, the job seeking factor most closely associated with looking for work was the number of firms contacted.

Number of Firms Contacted

Perhaps the number of firms contacted works better for the longer-term cases than the number of times work had been sought because the data on firms contacted covered a three month period. If job seeking fluctuates, then a three month period should give a better picture of someone's average level of effort than a figure based on the last two weeks. In any case, the number of firms contacted is the job seeking factor most strongly related to finding work among the longer-term group. The data are shown in Table 6-4.

TABLE 6-4

Success in Finding Work, by Number of Firms Contacted,
for Longer-Term Cases, in Percentages

<u>Number of Firms</u>	<u>Those Finding Work</u>	<u>Those Not Finding Work</u>	<u>Total</u>
0	8	16	14
1 - 19	62	69	67
20 and over	<u>30</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>19</u>
Total	100 (n=27)	.99* (n=64)	100 (n=91)

*Percentages do not sum to 100 because of rounding.

Among those who found work, thirty per cent said they had contacted twenty firms or more. Among those who had not found it, less than half as many had contacted this many firms. Among those who had not found work, eight per cent said, at the time of the first interview, that they had not contacted any firms in the last three months. Among those who did not find work, the proportion who had not made any contacts was more than twice as high.

Types of Firm Contacted

It is not just the number of firms contacted that matters. It also makes a difference what types of firms are contacted. On the first round of interviews, about half the males in each sample had only contacted manufacturing firms. The same was true of about one-seventh of the females among the January cases and about one-quarter of the females among the longer-term cases. Among the longer-term cases, those who had only contacted manufacturing firms were no more likely than those who had not been looking for work at all in the last two weeks to have found jobs. Among the short-term cases, those who had found jobs were too few for meaningful comparison, but the trend was in the same direction. It is worth noting that none of those in either sample who had only contacted the steel companies had found work.

The difficulty people had in finding any work among the larger manufacturing firms does not show through in our final figures on job finding. There are only so many large manufacturing firms to contact. After you have contacted them, you have to try elsewhere. Those who were at all active in job seeking made so many contacts elsewhere that the effects of looking among these firms, where the chances of being hired were remote, were masked.

Summary of Correlations

The last association we have discussed was masked by other things in our final figures. Some of the others were called in question

by a lack of association in one of the two samples. Some seemed to result from intervening variables.

But there are a number of things that seem to be clearly related to finding work. Those who were under eighteen were less likely to find work than those who were older. The probability of finding work rose with formal education. Those who had had jobs in the last two years were more likely to find work than those who had not. Those whose most recent jobs were relatively high on our occupational status scale were more likely to find work than those whose most recent jobs were towards the bottom of the scale. While they only seemed to work for the longer-term cases, five different personality items were related to finding a job. For both samples, expecting to find work in the next six months was associated with success. For both samples, the degree of job seeking effort was related to finding work.

PREDICTING JOB FINDING

As it happened, no single question explained more than sixteen per cent of the variance in finding work among the short-term cases, or more than ten per cent among the longer-term cases. So we had to see whether a combination of questions would do what individual questions would not. As was the case when we analyzed levels of job seeking, the combinations that we thought might work were not very helpful. So we tried a form of discriminant analysis.

Readers who are unfamiliar with this may find a few comments on what was involved helpful. Essentially, what was involved was this. Answers to a number of questions which, it was hoped, would explain success or failure in finding work were fed into a computer. The computer selected, one item at a time, a series of items which would provide the best possible prediction. At each step, an equation to predict job finding success or failure was worked out. When as many items as could be used had been put into the equation, a cut-off point

was selected. Cases on either side of the cut-off point were predicted either to find work or not to find it.

Let us see what this procedure produced. Let us begin with the January cases. For this sample, six items entered the prediction equation.* They were as follows:

1. Whether the respondent's most recent job had had an occupational status score of four or higher. (Coded as - Yes, 1 or No, 2)
2. Frequency of looking for work in the past two weeks.
3. Whether the respondent was looking for a specific type of work. (Coded as - Yes, 1 or No, 2)
4. Whether the respondent thought that welfare provided enough money to meet his needs. (Coded as - Yes, 1 or No, 2)
5. Age (Coded as - 16-17, 1; 18, 2; 19-21, 3; 22-25, 4)

Finding a job was coded 1. Not finding one was coded 2. The prediction formula is as follows:

Job finding score =

$$\begin{aligned} & .31 \text{ (Item 1)} - .036 \text{ (Item 2)} + .35 \text{ (Item 3)} - .36 \text{ (Item 4)} \\ & - .32 \text{ (Item 5)} + 2.12 \end{aligned}$$

The five items in the equation will explain forty-five per cent of the variance. This is 2.8 times as much as the best single question would explain. They also have the virtue of making sense. Four out of the five were individually associated with job finding. The one that was not was whether the respondent felt he was getting enough from

*The analysis was stopped at the point at which the contribution made by additional items would not, if the usual assumptions in testing for significance held, have been significant at the .05 level.

welfare to meet his needs. But it would seem to make sense that someone who felt he was in need would want a job more intensely and might, on that account, be more likely to get one.

The results for the longer-term cases made sense as well, although they do not explain as much of the variance. The five items in the prediction equation* are as follows:

1. Whether the respondent planned to leave the city. (Coded as - No, 1 and Yes, 2)
2. Number of firms contacted in the last three months. (Coded as - under 20, 1 and 20 or more, 2)
3. Age (Coded as - 16-17, 1; 18, 2; 19-21, 3; 22-25, 4)
4. Whether or not the respondent shared living expenses with anyone else. (Coded as - Yes, 1 or No, 2)
5. Whether the respondent was pregnant or had a preschool child. (Coded as - Yes, 1 or No, 0)

Finding a job was coded as 1. Not finding a job was coded as 2. The prediction formula is as follows:

Job finding score =

$$2.78 - .41 \text{ (Item 1)} - .34 \text{ (Item 2)} - .26 \text{ (Item 3)} + .22 \text{ (Item 4)} + .33 \text{ (Item 5)}$$

The equation will explain thirty-one per cent of the variance in job finding. Further, the items in the equation generally seem to make sense. Three of them were individually associated with job finding. While there were too few cases for being pregnant or having a small child to be significant as an individual item, it seems to make sense.

*We stopped the process at the point at which the contribution of other variables would no longer, if the usual assumptions in testing for significance held, have been significant at the .05 level.

The only difficult item is No. 4. Why should those who are not sharing expenses get jobs more often than those who are? Perhaps it is because of groups living together to reduce their costs. Under these circumstances, perhaps the pressure to find work would be lower. Or perhaps there are groups of people who have gotten together out of a common preference for a way of life in which work is relatively unimportant. So there are plausible answers. Whether they are correct cannot be determined from our data.

Accuracy of Prediction

For the January cases, we have been able to explain forty-five per cent of the variance in job finding. For the longer-term cases, we have explained thirty-one per cent. But how well can we predict whether a given individual finds work? Using the cut-off points within the scores provided by the prediction equation, (1.54 in each case), we find that, among the January cases, eighty-seven per cent of our predictions turn out correct. Among the longer-term cases, eighty-three per cent turn out to be correct.

Without knowing anything about the people involved, we could have got sixty-two per cent right among the short-term cases and sixty-six among the longer-term cases. (These were the percentages in the two samples who did not find work. All we would have to do would be to predict that everyone would fail, and we would be right almost two-thirds of the time.) It is the difference between what we could do without knowledge, and what we have been able to do that represents an advance. Among the short-term cases, we have made a two-thirds reduction in the number of errors we would have made without knowledge of the people in our sample. Among the longer-term cases, we reduced the errors by about one-half.

We are aware of no other studies of job finding in which this kind of prediction has been made. So reducing the errors that would otherwise have been made by as much as we have seems to mean that we have made considerable headway.

We did a preliminary analysis of cases using the classification system employed in analyzing frequency of job seeking. We concluded that it would not do as well with these data. We also examined the cases where the prediction was wrong, to see if there were any common factors which might explain why mistakes had been made. We could find none. So we must conclude that the predictions we have made are as good as we can make.

What do they tell us? There are three things that are common to the prediction equations for the two samples. Each contains a measure of frequency of job seeking. For the January cases, it is the number of times the respondents had looked for work in the last two weeks. For the longer-term cases, it is the number of firms contacted in the last three months. Each also contains age. Those under eighteen were less successful in both samples. Each contains as well some items that appear to have something to do with motivation to find work. Among the January cases, these items were whether the respondent had a specific type of work in mind, and whether he thought the income from welfare met his needs. Among the longer-term cases, the item was whether the respondent was thinking of leaving town.

The other items in the two equations are not readily compared. Among the January cases, the remaining item was whether the respondent's job had been in the upper four categories of the occupational status scale. No item so closely related to qualifications appeared in the equation for the longer-term cases, perhaps because there were fewer people with this level of experience. The remaining two items for the longer-term cases were for whether the respondent shared expenses with anyone else, or whether the respondent was pregnant or had a preschool child.

The two equations are alike in including items on age, level of job seeking and items which could be interpreted as showing an interest in finding work. Perhaps this may be taken as a suggestion that there are some rather general factors in job finding. Other items were specific to the two groups. This suggests the importance of being aware of idiosyncratic features of different groups in understanding whether they find work.

These points raise the question of whether it would be possible to define a prediction equation that would work well for both samples. We combined the two samples, and obtained an equation for the total group of two hundred twelve cases.

The five items in the prediction equation are as follows:

1. The first item was based on the number of firms contacted and the frequency of looking for work in the past two weeks.
(The number of firms contacted was coded as - 20 or more, 2; or less than 20, 1. Frequency of looking was coded as - 4 or less, 1; or 5 or more, 2. Item 1 was calculated as $(4 \text{ (number of firms)} + 3 \text{ (frequency of looking)}) / 7$)
2. Occupational status category of the job most recently held.
(Coded as - 4 or above, 1 and 5 or below, 2)
3. Whether the respondent planned to leave Hamilton. (Coded as - No, 1 or Yes, 2)
4. Age (Coded as - 17 or less, 1 and 18 or more, 2)
5. Whether the respondent was looking for a specific type of work. (Coded as - Yes, 1 or No, 2)

The prediction equation is as follows:

Job finding score =

$$2.06 - .35 \text{ (Item 1)} + .27 \text{ (Item 2)} - .22 \text{ (Item 3)} - .21 \text{ (Item 4)} + .14 \text{ (Item 5)}$$

The equation will explain about twenty-two per cent of the variance in job finding. If we select the best cutting point within the range of values given by the prediction equation, we can correctly predict success or failure in finding work for seventy-six per cent of the cases in each of the two samples. We have reduced the number of errors we would have made if we knew nothing about the cases by about one-third.

These results, while a clear advance on what could have been achieved by chance, are not nearly as good as those for the two samples taken separately.

Two of the items that were found in the prediction equations for both samples have come into the equation for the two samples taken together. These were intensity of job seeking and age. Two of the other three items were found in the equation for the short-term cases but not for the longer-term cases. These were the status score for the job most recently held and whether the respondent had a specific type of work in mind. The other item, whether the respondent planned to leave the city, was found in the equation for the longer-term cases, but not for the short-term cases.

It seems, then, that the reason why we could not do as well with the samples taken together as for the two taken separately is that the best items for the two taken together are often items which do not work as well in one sample as in the other. Age and intensity of job seeking work well for the two samples, although the measures used for job seeking differ. The other items do not. So we must conclude that an important element in our understanding job finding, among our samples, must be a knowledge of the particular characteristics of the group under study.

The writer is familiar with only one Canadian study in which an attempt has been made to analyze variance in job finding. It is D. R. Maki's Search Behaviour in Canadian Labour Markets. Maki used data on a national sample of nine hundred thirty-one people who had been unemployed for five weeks or more in 1968. He was able to explain nineteen per cent of the variance in job finding.* Part of this was due to age differences that do not apply in our sample. Part of it was due to regional differences that do not apply either.

*Maki, op. cit., Table 1, page 24.

We have been able to do substantially better for our two samples. We have been able to explain thirty-one per cent of the variance among the longer-term cases and forty-five per cent with the short-term cases. This may reflect the fact that we were able to gather more data on individual cases than was available to Maki, or that our sample was less embracing.

However this may be, we have gone as far as we can in explaining job finding within our samples. There is still a substantial amount left unexplained. Part of this probably could not be explained with the kinds of data at our disposal. For example, to the extent to which getting a job is a matter of hitting it off well with an interviewer or of showing up at a firm at just the time a vacancy arises, the kind of data we have gathered would not be very helpful. But the only way we will find out how far we can go in explaining job finding is for much more research than has currently been carried out to be done.

Now we must turn to consider what our findings suggest about public policy.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 7 - SOME POLICY RELATED QUESTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Why Are People On Welfare?	7-1
What Is It Like On Welfare?	7-5
Are People Making Reasonable Efforts To Find Work? . .	7-6
What Needs To Be Done To Get People Into Appropriate Jobs Faster?	7-9

CHAPTER 7

SOME POLICY RELATED QUESTIONS

In this chapter, we would like to discuss our findings on four major questions:

- 1) Why are single young people on welfare?
- 2) What is it like on welfare?
- 3) Are people making reasonable efforts to find work?
- 4) What needs to be done to get people into appropriate jobs faster?

WHY ARE SINGLE YOUNG PEOPLE ON WELFARE?

This question should be considered in two parts. We need to know why people did not have jobs at the time they came onto welfare, and why they do not find them after a period of time on the rolls. Let us first consider the reasons why people came on welfare.

We might divide our sample into three groups: those who had never had jobs, those whose employment had been interrupted by a jail sentence, and those who had lost their jobs. Among our sample, relatively few, about seven per cent, had never had full-time jobs. These were usually people who had dropped out of school recently and not found work in the meantime. Most were living with their parents, who were pleased that they did not have to support their children now that they were out of school.

We cannot be very precise from our data about the number who had come directly from jail onto welfare. The percentage is probably about the same as those who had never held a full-time job.

The vast bulk of the cases appear to consist of people who had jobs, but who, for one reason or another, had lost them. We have seen in Chapter 4 that people had left their most recent jobs for quite a

variety of reasons. About one-tenth had been fired. About three-tenths had been laid off. About two-tenths had quit. About one-tenth had found their jobs eliminated. Another tenth had had short-term jobs. The remaining cases had left for quite a variety of reasons.

We noted in Chapter 4 that the reasons for which people had left their most recent jobs pointed up the precarious nature of the work they had been able to get. Suppose we make the rather extreme assumption that all those who were fired deserved it, and that all those who quit had no good reason. Even so, we still find that more than half, perhaps as many as three-quarters, depending on how we handle the cases in the "other" category, had been in jobs they had lost through no apparent fault of their own. The jobs had been short-term, they had been eliminated, employment was seasonal, companies had had to make lay-offs, etc. In these situations, the reasons why someone required public assistance lay in the nature of the job he had been able to get.

Our data will not sustain a full analysis of why our respondents had so often been in precarious jobs, but there are some obvious reasons. There are no local figures, but nationally, unemployment rates among people under twenty-five at the beginning of 1972 were running at sixteen per cent for males and nine per cent for females.* Under circumstances of this kind, it would be expected that people would very often have to take precarious jobs. As we have shown in Chapter 4, twenty per cent of our short-term cases and thirty per cent of our longer-term cases had no secondary schooling, compared to thirteen per cent of the out-of-school population aged fifteen to twenty-four in the Metropolitan Hamilton area. Those with relatively little education are likely to suffer in a situation of high unemployment. Our respondents were no exception.

*Department of Manpower and Immigration. The Labour Force, January, 1972, Table 3.

Analysis of the reasons for the level of unemployment at the time of our study is beyond the scope of this report. But clearly, the effects of such factors as labour force growth, and fiscal and monetary policy, must be taken into account if we want to understand why people are on welfare. If the cure for inflation involves unemployment, and if inflation must be fought, we are going to have people on welfare. It is those who are least able to obtain secure positions who are most likely to feel the effects of counter-inflationary policies. In reviewing the evidence on welfare use among single employable people in Ontario in 1971, the Swadron Commission remarked:

"It is hardly necessary to go beyond population and unemployment statistics to account for the increase in unattached employable recipients of public assistance. It is scarcely necessary to speculate whether laziness or work avoidance is an important cause. It is not likely that in the last two years 20,000 persons suddenly grew lazy and looked for welfare instead of work."*

But what we have been able to say offers only a rather general explanation of why people come on welfare in the first place. Once they are on welfare, why do they remain? We have treated this at some length in Chapter 6. Here we will simply skim over the major elements in our findings.

First, we should note that marketability is a key factor. Those who were older, with more education, and more job experience were more likely to find work. Other questions related to desire for a job made a difference. A number of personality characteristics were connected to finding work among the longer-term cases. In both samples, an important factor was the level of job seeking.

The trouble is that no single question will explain more than about one-sixth of the variance in job finding among the January cases or more than one-tenth of it among the longer-term cases. With all of the personal data we collected, we could explain no more than forty-five

*Swadron, B.B., op.cit., p.62

per cent among the short-term cases, and thirty-one per cent among the longer-term cases. So we must consider other things than the individual.

Some of what we could not explain was probably a matter of chance. People were at the right place at the right time, hit it off especially well with an interviewer, or the like. Part of what we missed was likely to have been a matter of detail. We had collected only very general data on qualifications, and could not survey the labour market to determine the demand for specific backgrounds.

Another important question is the speed with which people are able to find work. This naturally depends on the number of jobs open for which they are eligible. As we have noted, we did the study at a time when unemployment rates, by postwar standards, were rather high. A twelve month average centered on the period of the study, for the Hamilton Canada Manpower Management Area, shows 5.1% unemployment.* While a study of personal characteristics and behaviour, such as we did, can help us to understand which people get jobs, the average speed with which people with a given set of characteristics will get jobs will be determined by the state of the market. Among our sample, just over one-third found work by the end of April, 1972. It is unfortunate that we do not have data on comparable groups at different times to see how much difference the unemployment rate makes in the speed at which people go off welfare.

We might sum up our answers to the question of why single young people are on welfare in three points:

1. The people who end up on welfare are likely to be those who have just left school, who have just come out of jail, or who have been in precarious jobs. The vast majority will be

*This figure is based on unpublished data from the Monthly Labour Force Survey provided by Statistics Canada. The Canada Manpower Hamilton Management Area stretches southwest to Brantford, south to Lake Erie, and east to Lake Ontario.

in the latter group. Those who have had this kind of job are likely to have relatively low education, and are more likely than average to come from families low on the social status scale.

2. Personal characteristics determine to a significant degree which people will get off welfare most rapidly. As we have noted in Chapter 6, we were able to do about two-thirds better at predicting who would find work among the short-term cases than we could have done without knowledge of individual cases. Among the longer-term cases, we were able to do about fifty per cent better.
3. The length of time they remain will also depend on the state of the labour market. There are no data available with which we can be precise about the relationship between labour market conditions and how long people will stay on welfare.

WHAT IS IT LIKE ON WELFARE?

As we pointed out in Chapter 4, about half of our respondents said that they were basically content with their lives. The other half expressed some form of dissatisfaction, usually about the fact that they were without work. The number who said that they were basically content would seem to suggest that, however undesirable it is to be on welfare, it is at least not something that makes a basic satisfaction with life impossible for many people.

At the same time, very few had anything good to say about welfare. Close to eighty per cent said that they did not have enough income to meet their needs. Two-thirds said they did not have enough to get adequate food, clothing or shelter. (We suggested in Chapter 4 that this should be interpreted to mean that they were not receiving enough money.) More than seven-eighths said that, apart from the income difference between working and being on welfare, it would still be better to be working. Those who disliked being on welfare mentioned such things

as being bored because of sitting around, being downgraded by other people, and missing a sense of being productive. Only two per cent said both that their incomes on welfare were adequate and that, apart from income, welfare was preferable.

Perhaps we should conclude that while a good many people were not suffering extreme deprivation, there is real economic pressure on our respondents. Four out of five also said that, apart from the level of income, they would prefer to be working. At the same time, there were many who were not too unhappy with their overall situation. Being on welfare, for them, was apparently not too painful, and there were satisfactions in other areas of life.

ARE PEOPLE MAKING REASONABLE EFFORTS TO FIND WORK?

The General Welfare Assistance Act states that if a person is not considered to be unemployable, he will be eligible for assistance if he is making a reasonable effort to find work. There is no clear definition of what is meant by the expression "reasonable effort".

There does not seem to be any obvious way of setting a cut-off point above which the person is looking hard enough to meet the requirements of the Act and below which he is not. But it would seem difficult to argue that someone who does not look for work at least once in two weeks is meeting them, unless there are extenuating circumstances. As we noted in Chapter 4, one-quarter of the people we talked to had not been looking for work in the two weeks before the first interview.

There were some cases in which extenuating circumstances were clearly present. A few people were ill, or had to be out of town for part of the period. Some young women were pregnant or were single mothers. If we were to remove these cases from consideration, about one-fifth of our samples would remain.

A number of reasons might be suggested for which they had not been seeking work. Perhaps they had tried very hard to find work and

then become discouraged. Or perhaps they saw their chances of finding work as almost nil. But neither of these seems to be an explanation for what we found. As we pointed out in Chapter 5, while individual cases changed, there was no sign of a trend either up or down in job seeking between the first and second interviews. Nor is there any great difference between the short-term and the longer-term cases. While some people may have become discouraged over time, then, this was certainly not general. Then, too, as we noted in Chapter 5, there was no significant relationship between how likely people thought they were to get the kind of job they wanted and their level of job seeking.* So, while either of these factors may explain a number of cases, neither seems to have much general explanatory power.

Another possibility has been suggested by Elliott Liebow. In his study of Negro men who frequented a particular street corner in a large American city, Liebow explained why work was not of great importance to many of them in the following way:

"The rest of society holds the job of dishwasher or janitor or unskilled labourer in low esteem if not outright contempt. So does the street corner man. He cannot do otherwise. He cannot draw from a job those social values which other people do not put into it."**

"Delivering little and promising no more, the job is 'no big thing'."***

This may explain what happens in some cases. But its explanatory power is very low for our data. There is no significant association between level of job seeking and education or between level

* Possibly, those who were discouraged were counter-balanced by those who looked harder because of the apparent difficulties.

** Liebow, Elliott, Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men, Little, Brown, 1967, pp. 58-59.

***op. cit., p.63

of job seeking and the occupational status score for a person's most recent job. If a lack of attraction to low status jobs was the explanation for our results, we might expect those who had more education, or who had held higher status jobs, and whose marketability was greatest, to be looking more frequently. To strengthen the argument, it might be noted that among those who had had specific types of work in mind, there was no correlation between job seeking and the occupational status score of the job the person was thinking of.

Another possibility would be a variation on the "culture of poverty" theme. Perhaps people have grown up in families on welfare, have had little encouragement to do well in school, and have many acquaintances who are in the same position. In these circumstances, it would be understandable that they would not be looking for work very hard. As it happens, though, of the three factors mentioned, only coming from a family on welfare makes a difference in levels of job seeking. If we use it as a predictor of who looks for work and who does not, it explains only two per cent of the variance.

It would seem, then, that the more obvious explanations for why people had not looked for work do not explain very much. As we have seen in Chapter 5, the fullest understanding of job seeking levels could be obtained by looking at patterns in the answers that people gave us. These patterns often seemed to reflect particular views of life. We will return to this point later in this Chapter.

First, we would like to acknowledge that the interpretation of "reasonable effort" we have been using might not be appropriate in some circumstances. This might be argued, for example, in a situation in which the number of jobs available was highly restricted. In the extreme case, one person going off welfare would simply mean another person losing work.

In practice, of course, the situation is almost never so extreme. Even if, in the short run, the number of jobs available is fixed, there is always a good deal to be said for filling vacancies as quickly as possible. Furthermore, getting people to work more quickly

could be expected to have a multiplier effect. Their additional production means extra income for them, which will have a stimulating effect in other parts of the economy.

Unfortunately, this could run counter to fiscal and monetary policies at the senior levels of government. Let us suppose that in order to combat inflation, the senior levels of government wish to hold down aggregate demand. Let us suppose that, by some means, large numbers of welfare recipients could be gotten to work more quickly than is now the case. It is possible, under these circumstances, that in order to contain inflation, a matching tightening of fiscal or monetary policy might take place. If this were to occur, then the effect of more successful programs of getting people to work might be cancelled. This is not inevitable, of course. But the point does remind us that there are real limits to what can be done by modifications in the welfare system.

Let us suppose, though, that the rather frustrating situation we have just described does not hold. In this case, it is in the interests of both recipients and the public to get people back to work as quickly as possible. The vast majority of those we talked to said they would prefer to work. Keeping people on welfare is expensive, and multiplier effects mean additional gains for the public.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO GET PEOPLE INTO APPROPRIATE JOBS FASTER?

Our attempt to predict who would find work and who would not, reported in Chapter 6, led us to the suggestion that there were three rather general factors involved: marketability, intensity of job seeking, and interest in finding work. In the very short run, there is little that can be done to change a person's qualifications. But there are government sponsored programs which do provide upgrading or new skills for a great many people over a period of time. Unfortunately,

almost half the people we talked to had completed less than Grade 10, and hence would require more basic education before entry to most skill training programs. The required up-grading can be provided under Manpower programs; it is just that these take time.

Intensity of job seeking and interest in finding work are capable of changing more quickly. There are also things which can be dealt with more directly by the public assistance system.

It must be recognized, however, that changing people's interest in work is not likely to be easy. People's attitudes to something as central to our culture as work are likely to have been built up over a period of time, and will often be resistive to change.

As noted in Chapter 1, we expected that methods of job seeking might be changed more readily. We have seen in Chapter 5 that many people placed an emphasis early in their job seeking on major manufacturing firms, where there were, in many cases, few chances of finding work. About half the people we talked to did not have a specific type of work in mind. These considerations suggest that the people had not thought through what they were qualified for, or what they would like to do. This kind of thing could be influenced by programs designed to help people clarify what the job market was like and where they could fit into it. The Creative Job Search program now being run by Canada Manpower Centres would seem an appropriate approach to this.

Another factor, and possibly the more important one, is the intensity of job seeking. In order to clarify what impact might be had on this, we will have to review our findings on which people are looking for work and which are not. First, let us look at the individual items associated with job seeking.

Unfortunately, many of the questions that showed some predictive power concerned the past, so the things they referred to could not be changed. For example, having grown up in a family on welfare, and

having dropped out of school because it was boring or because of an inability to hack it were both related to low levels of job seeking, but neither can be changed. (Of course, it may be possible to change the attitudes involved in this, but that is another matter, and not likely an easy one.)

Some characteristics of present behaviour which were linked to job seeking effort might be changed, but only under special circumstances. For example, marijuana use was related to job seeking effort, but it can be influenced only if a counsellor knows about it. Then, too, having any real influence on this sort of thing is not easy.

There do seem to be things of which workers would ordinarily be aware and on which some influence might more easily be had. For example, people's plans for the next six months and their hopes for the longer-term future were related to job seeking activity. These are matters on which people could be helped to bring their thoughts into clearer focus.

The trouble is that these individual things, even if they are amenable to influence, are not very good predictors of how hard people will look for work. As we have shown in Chapter 5, no individual question will explain more than one-eighth of the variance in looking for work among the short-term cases or one-twelfth among the longer-term cases. As we have also seen in Chapter 5, to get a fuller understanding of what was happening, we had to look at patterns of answers. Perhaps looking at these will give us some further idea of what might be done.

At one end of the scale, the end at which most people were looking actively for work, probably the only thing that needs to be done is to make sure that people are aware of possible openings. They will look after the rest. It would seem from the characteristics of the groups who were not looking very hard that much more could be involved. Four such groups were defined in each sample. Let us briefly review what they were like.

Among the short-term cases, the first group was described as "hanging loose". All said they lived day by day and were content with their lives in general. None mentioned getting a job as a hope for the future. Most disagreed with the statement, "I make plans and follow them." Most agreed with the statement, "I do not often feel like taking on new responsibilities." It would seem that these people had an orientation to life that would have to be modified if they were to become very active job seekers. Many of them had completed high school, so that when they did look for work, they were more likely to find it than others. If an influence could be had on this group, then it might have a rather quick pay-off.

The second group consisted of sixteen and seventeen year olds who had just dropped out of school. None had more than Grade 8 education (unless he had been in a special program for slow learners). All came from families that had been on welfare. All said that they sometimes worried about their ability to do the things people expected of them or asked of them. All of them said they lived day by day and were basically content with their lives. Our interviewers remarked that some of them had very little idea of how to go about looking for a job. Since this group seemed to have little in the way of marketable skills as well as a low level of job seeking, it may be that an effort would have to be made not only to lead them to seek work more actively, but also to find appropriate places to look.

The third group consists of young women who showed a strong orientation to marriage and little orientation to work. Here, presumably, an effort would have to be made to stimulate an interest in employment.

The fourth group consists of people who said they were content with life in the present, drank alcohol more than occasionally, and had very active social lives. They seemed to be having a good time in life. Here, perhaps, an attempt would have to be made to get people to see that there were things they were missing, and that, in the longer term,

there would be greater rewards from employment.

Among the groups in the January sample who were not looking for work very hard, a particular view of life seemed to be involved in lack of effort. We have suggested some of the things that might have to be done to influence these groups. In practice, of course, what would be involved would be much more complex, since no two people are fully alike. But it does seem clear that the kinds of views of life involved are the kind that might take some changing. The same appears with the longer-term cases.

Everyone in the first group among the longer-term cases was either pregnant or had a preschool child. It would seem that the reasons for not looking for work did not reflect a lack of interest in employment. Rather, they felt that any job they took would have to allow them to see that their children were well cared for, and provide enough money that they would be better off than they would be on welfare.

The second group was also all female. This group showed signs of a low level of vitality. None described herself as enthusiastic. All said they felt depressed. All had left school because of boredom or inability to hack it. They did not seem to be receiving any impetus from other people to find work. For this group, what would seem to be necessary would be to try to raise their level of motivation. But to do this might require changing something rather basic in their emotional state. This would not be expected to be an easy thing.

The third group was all male. Like the preceding group, it showed signs of a lack of vitality. All said they felt depressed. Most said they found it hard to think of things they felt like doing. Most said they did not become enthusiastic about a lot of things. At the same time, there were signs of low self-discipline. Most said they used marijuana, and they used strong drugs more often than rarely. All said the statement, "I make plans and follow them" was false. It would seem, then, that an effort would have to be made to get people interested in looking for work in spite of an overall lack of vitality and a certain lack of self-discipline.

The final group was very much like the final one among the short-term cases. The members of this group all said they were content with life and that they drank alcohol more often than occasionally. Like the comparable group among the short-term cases, they were interested in social life. Like the short-term group, they might well need to be persuaded that, in the long term, there would be greater rewards from employment.

To influence many of these groups to become active job seekers would seem a difficult task. In most cases, it appears that their views of life were not the kind that would seem likely to lead to vigorous job seeking.

A more serious difficulty, from a policy viewpoint, is the sheer diversity of the groups. The needs of the groups appear to be quite different.

The diversity of these groups reflects the general diversity of the population. It was pointed out in Chapter 3 that very few people gave answers that matched more than eighteen times out of twenty-three with the answers given by other people on the questions used to develop our illustrative cases. In Chapter 4, we noted that there were relatively few things that were true of more than two-thirds of the people we talked to. In Chapter 5, we noted that while we could find groups whose levels of job seeking were about the same, and who were alike in other ways, these groups were all small.

The sheer diversity of the sample makes it difficult to provide a simple answer to the question of how to get people into productive employment more quickly. Educational levels range from Grade 4 to university graduation. The number of times people had gone out looking for work in the last two weeks ranged from none to fifteen to twenty times. Interest in finding work varied from "I don't dig it" to "Finding a job is the most important thing in my life."

Whatever is done by the welfare system must take into account the wide range of differences in this type of population. The needs of very different people must be assessed, and appropriate programs must be available to handle the wide range of cases that present themselves. There can be no easy general solutions; what must be done is to carefully review the kinds of situations that are likely to come up and to ensure that appropriate responses can and will be given. It is a complex task, but if the best service is to be given to this kind of population, the task must be carried out.

* * * * *

APPENDIX A - METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Sampling	A-1
Statistical Problems Resulting From Population And Sample Sizes	A-3
Interviewer Effects	A-4
Sample Bias - Convictions In Magistrate's Court . . .	A-6

APPENDIX A

This appendix deals with four methodological questions:

- 1) sampling
- 2) statistical problems resulting from sample and population sizes
- 3) interviewer effects
- 4) sample bias

SAMPLING

In our discussion of sampling in Chapter 2, we omitted, for the sake of simplicity, one of the factors that determined the type of sample we drew. The omitted factor was our uncertainty over how many interviewers we would have.

Initially, we had hoped to have four interviewers working full-time over a four month period. If this had been possible, we would not have had to draw samples from among the males who had been on the rolls for three months or more. We could have simply tried to contact them all.

As it happened, Project 500, a winter employment program sponsored by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, was able to provide us with four workers. But only three could be put into interviewing on a regular basis. When one of the interviewers had to be let go, Project 500 was unable, because of budget problems, to replace him. Some additional funds were found from other sources to hire another interviewer to work for a few weeks. But, altogether, we were not able to do many more than the number of interviews that could have been done by two full-time interviewers over the period of the study.

If we had known at the beginning of the study that this would be our situation, we might have drawn different samples. But we learned only in February that further funds could not be obtained to bring us up

to four full-time interviewers. We discovered only late in February, two weeks after one interviewer had been let go, that he could not be replaced. In the meantime, we had to make decisions as to what to do with the interviewers we had. We decided that, in January, we would concentrate our efforts on those who had come on the rolls in that month. We had just enough staff to do a complete sample.

Had we settled for a partial sample, we would have been able to do a more thorough job on the longer-term cases. But, while there was still hope that we could get the interviewers we needed to do a complete sample of the longer-term cases, we did not want to cut back on the short-term ones. Since we wanted to catch them as soon as possible after their arrival on welfare, we could not delay interviewing them to see what the financial situation would be. So the flexibility that would have resulted if we had cut back on the January cases was not available when it became clear that we could not do a total sample of the longer-term cases.

The 5-8 week span between the first and second interviews was largely the result of the same factors. Theoretically, the average span could have been two months. We could only keep our interviewers for four months. January was taken up by interviewing newcomers to the rolls. Since we did one-third more interviews among the longer-term cases than among the newcomers, the first round of interviewing was completed well into March. Accordingly, the average span between interviews had to be reduced to just over six weeks.*

*In view of the little that was known about the group, any between-interview interval selected would have been rather arbitrary. It might be noted, though, that the literature on crisis intervention suggests that crises are often resolved in this period. So it seemed that, viewing unemployment or going on welfare as a crisis, a six-week period might give us some idea of how it was handled psychologically.

STATISTICAL PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM SAMPLE AND POPULATION SIZES

One technical problem, whose influence will be felt throughout Chapters 4 to 6, results from the sizes of our samples and the sizes of the populations from which they were drawn. Readers will recall that among those who came on the rolls in January, 1972, we interviewed ninety people out of a possible one hundred ten. The people who, as of January 31st, 1972, had been on the rolls for three months or more were broken into three categories. Among the females, we interviewed forty-four out of sixty-nine. Among the males who had been on from three to six months, we interviewed forty-one out of one hundred twenty-nine. Among the males who had been on longer than six months, we interviewed thirty-seven out of one hundred eighty-seven.

Now, all of the usual methods of setting confidence intervals, or of testing for significance, assume that the distribution of sampling errors will approximate normality. But for our sample of short-term cases, and for our sample of female longer-term cases, the normal approximation does not work well. So for these two groups, confidence intervals have had to be established from tables of the hypergeometric distribution.

While this is somewhat more difficult than using the normal approximation, it poses little problem by itself. But in the case of the female longer-term cases, an additional problem arises. If the distribution of sampling error for the female cases and for the two groups of male cases could be satisfactorily approximated by the normal distribution, it would be a straightforward method to estimate the sampling error for estimates made for the total group. But the distribution of sampling error for the female cases is not near normal.

Fortunately, the differences are such that, if we employ the normal approximation, the test will be conservative. So in order to avoid the substantial computational problems involved in working out precise confidence intervals in this kind of situation, we have used the normal approximation for female longer-term cases when we have developed confidence intervals on estimates made for the longer-term population as a whole.

Another, more difficult, problem posed by our samples and population sizes had to do with correlation measures. To test the significance of any correlation measure, we must know (or assume) its sampling distribution. But the sampling distributions of all the correlation measures for ordinal data with which the writer is familiar have been worked out for sampling from infinite populations only.

Fortunately, the sampling variance for sampling from a finite population will always be lower than the sampling variance for an infinite population (assuming the distributions of the variables being correlated remain the same). But when samples rise to ninety out of one hundred ten cases, this seems a highly conservative approach.

As it happened, we had no choice. We did not have the resources required to work out the distributions of sampling error for the sample and population sizes we were working with. Either we used tests based on sampling from an infinite population, or we did not test for significance. It should be borne in mind, accordingly, that all tests of significance reported for ordinal correlation measures are conservative. While we cannot specify the extent of their conservatism, it would seem, intuitively, that, at least in some cases, it may be quite pronounced.

INTERVIEWER EFFECTS

It was noted in Chapter 2 that possible interviewer effects would be mentioned, where appropriate, in the text. For interested readers, we would like to describe how we tested for interviewer differences, and the types of differences that arose.

Three interviewers were tested on the data from each round of interviewing. (The others had not done enough interviews to be tested.) χ^2 tests were done on all variables where the response pattern provided high enough expected values to make the tests meaningful. Except where the response pattern would not allow it, ordinal variables were trichotomized. Nominal variables were collapsed as necessary.

Where significant differences emerged, we tried to explain them, if possible, as the results of interviewer effects or of differences among the people contacted by the different interviewers. As an example of the former, we might take the question, "Would you like to get married?". One interviewer interpreted this to include common law relationships.* As an example of the latter, we might take our question on what things people felt they could not do on welfare because of the payment level. One interviewer had an above chance number of answers about buying clothes. But he also had interviewed an above chance number of females; other interviewers drew this type of answer from females equally often. We concluded that the number of females among his respondents was the explanation for the number of answers involving clothes that he received. In other cases, we had no ready explanation for why a difference appeared among the interviewers. Table A-1 shows the results of our analysis of interviewer differences.

Generally speaking, it appears that the number of differences not explained can be attributed without difficulty to chance. The only really doubtful situation appears to be that of the longer-term cases on the first round of interviews. However, the interviewers had rather different respondent groups, and only differences which were clearly attributable to respondent characteristics were assigned to that category. In a number of cases where differences have been classed as "not explained", a good case could have been made for saying that they resulted from respondent characteristics. On balance, it seemed reasonable to attribute the unexplained differences in this situation to chance. The conclusion, then, was that only those differences definitely attributed to the interviewers should be considered to be the result of interviewer effects.

*This was discovered after about two weeks of interviewing. It probably affected no more than four or five responses.

TABLE A-1
Interviewers' Differences

	Short-Term Cases - 1st Round	Short-term Cases - 2nd Round	Longer- Term Cases - 1st Round	Longer- Term Cases - 2nd Round
Number of Questions Tested	106	98	94	99
Number Showing Differences	18	5	25	14
Differences Attri- buted to Interviewers	5	2	5	2
Differences Attri- buted to Respondent Characteristics	5	2	10	5
Differences Not Explained	8	1	10	7

SAMPLE BIAS - CONVICTIONS IN MAGISTRATE'S COURT

The records we worked with covered ten of the twelve months, May, 1971 to April, 1972. These records showed names, ages and addresses for everyone convicted during that period. Since young people involved with the Court move very often, only their names and ages were of any real use. What we had to do, then, was to estimate how many of the people who had been convicted were found in our samples, and in the larger groups from which the samples were drawn.

In most cases, it would seem very unlikely that there are two people in Hamilton with the same name who are the same age. But there might well be more than one, say, John Smith, of the same age. Where it appeared to us that it was reasonable to believe two people were not the same, we did not count the case. Whether we were right or wrong in any

given case is unclear. So our figures on the number of people who were convicted in Magistrate's Court are estimates, and are, in their nature, imprecise.

Yet the figures had to be taken seriously. People with a history of conflict with the law might be wary of researchers. If they had been involved in a crime recently, they might wish to avoid contact with anyone. Other things in which we were interested might be linked to a history of conflict with the law. So we wanted to get an idea of whether we had interviewed as high a proportion of these people as we had of others.

The results are shown in Table A-2. It should be noted that we are looking at males only; there were too few females convicted to mean very much.

It will be seen that among those who had been on the rolls for three months or more, there is little difference between those we interviewed and those we did not. Twenty-eight per cent of the people we talked to had been convicted, against thirty-three per cent of those we did not.

But among those who had come on the rolls in January, the difference was much greater. Thirty-three per cent of those we talked to had been convicted. Among those we could not reach, ten of the thirteen people had been convicted. We must conclude that, in this respect, our sample of newcomers to the rolls was biased.

How serious is this? Our sample would have been unbiased if eight of the ten people who were convicted but whom we could not reach had been interviewed. Adding eight cases to a sample of ninety could never change the percentage giving a particular answer by more than about eight. But this would happen only if all eight new people gave one answer, and all ninety in the original sample gave a different answer (or answers). In less extreme situations, the impact of the new cases would be less pronounced.

Now for our purposes, differences of this order would not often matter much. This was fortunate, since we could not be certain which questions would have been affected. There was one way of getting some perspective on this, though. We could divide our sample into those who had been convicted and those who had not, and see whether the answers given by the two groups were the same.

As it happened, the pattern of differences for both the first and the second interview could be readily attributed to chance.* That is, among those who were interviewed, the people who had been convicted did not differ in any general way from those who had not been convicted.

TABLE A-2

Percentages of Male Respondents and of Non-Respondents
Convicted in Magistrate's Court in Preceding Year,
Estimated for Sample Groups

	<u>Percentage Convicted</u>		
	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Non- Respondents</u>	<u>Total</u>
Newcomers to Welfare Rolls	33 (n=52)	77 (n=13)	42 (n=65)
On Welfare Three Months or More	28 (n=78)	33 (n=238)	32 (n=316)
Total	30 (n=130)	35 (n=251)	33 (n=381)

This might be taken as another reason not to be too concerned about the bias in the sample. Over the range of the questions we asked,

*More technically, less than five per cent of the answers differed at the .05 level.

the simple fact of having been convicted in the past year did not seem to make much difference.*

Now, the possible effect of the bias is limited, as we have shown; and those who had been convicted did not differ systematically from those who had not. So we have treated the sample as if it was unbiased. The reader should bear in mind, however, that some relatively small distortions may creep in because of this.

We cannot be certain where these may arise; but it seems prudent to be cautious about questions on which the two groups in our sample did differ. So in cases where a question on which those who had been convicted differed significantly from those who had not, and where it appears this might have changed the figures for a particular response by three per cent or more, this has been noted when figures on the responses to the question are first presented.

*This may seem puzzling. While we have no direct evidence to support them, there are at least three plausible explanations for why this should be so. One is that those who were convicted in Magistrate's Court in the last year are not the only ones who had been involved in illegal activities. We know that some had been in trouble before. (They told us so.) Some had been in jail for much of the preceding year, and, hence, were not in a very good position to commit further offences. Presumably, others committed offences but were not caught. A second possibility is that, while there are real differences between those who are and are not convicted in Magistrate's Court, we have simply not asked questions in the areas in which they are present. We have no evidence to suggest how far either explanation will carry us. The writer would not be surprised if there were some truth in each of them. The third possibility is that, fundamentally, those who have been convicted and those who have not do not differ that greatly. This would be one possible interpretation of the implications of the "labelling" theory. It is often suggested that an important link in the chain that leads to adult crime is that a child is "labelled" delinquent; having been labelled, he comes to believe that he is delinquent; his belief is reinforced when he is put into institutions full of other people who have been similarly labelled, from whom he will also learn the tricks of the trade. But if he had been handled in a way that avoided labelling him as a delinquent, and that avoided putting him in intimate contact with others who had also been labelled, he might well not have ended up as a criminal in adulthood. Now, to the extent that this theory is true, we would expect that, apart from things that are direct consequences of having been labelled delinquent and having been involved with the criminal justice system, those who have been involved in crime as adults should not be too different from those who had not.

APPENDIX B - FIRST ROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

January 10, 1972

SINGLE YOUNG PEOPLE ON WELFARE

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Case Number	1	
	2	
	3	
Card	4	
Sex: 1. M	5	
2. F		
Sample: 1. new cases	6	
2. old cases		
Interview	7	
Interviewer	8	
1. How long have you been in Hamilton?	9	
0. N.A.		
1. a week or less		
2. over one week up to a month		
3. over one month up to six months		
4. over six months up to a year		
5. over a year up to two years		
6. over two years up to five years (Skip to Question 3)		
7. over five years up to ten years (Skip to Question 3)		
8. over ten years (Skip to Question 3)		
2. How many different communities have you lived in in the last two years?	10	
0. N.A.		
1. 2		
2. 3		
3. 4		
4. 5-9		
5. 10-19		
6. 20 or more		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
3. Do you have any plans to leave Hamilton? (When?)	11	
0. N.A.		
1. No		
2. Uncertain		
3. Yes, inside of a month		
4. Yes, inside of six months		
5. Yes, after more than six months		
6. Yes, at an indefinite time		
Do not ask Question 4 of those who have been in Hamilton more than 10 years.		
4. Why did you come to Hamilton?	12	
0. N.A.	13	
1. came with family	14	
2. to look for employment		
3. had a job offer		
4. for education		
5. more fun (action, bright lights) here		
6. easier to get welfare here		
7. friends here		
8. more girls (guys) here		
9. just travelling through		
10. other (specify)		
5. How old are you now?	15	
0. N.A.		
1. 16		
2. 17		
3. 18		
4. 19		
5. 20		
6. 21		
7. 22		
8. 23		
9. 24-25		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
6. How many brothers and sisters do you have?	16	
0. N.A. 1. none 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4 6. 5 7. 6 8. 7 9. 8 or more		
7. What does(did) your father do?	17 18	
7a. In what field(industry) does(did) he work?	19	
8. Where did you grow up?	20	
0. N.A. 1. in Hamilton 2. elsewhere in Metro Hamilton 3. elsewhere in Ontario 4. in the Maritimes 5. in Quebec 6. elsewhere in Canada 7. in the U.S. 8. in Europe 9. elsewhere		
9. How far did you go with your schooling?	21	
0. N.A. 1. no formal education 2. 0-4 years 3. 5 years or more, but elementary incomplete 4. elementary complete 5. some secondary, but not up to Grade 10 6. Grade 10, but secondary incomplete 7. secondary complete 8. university training 9. post-secondary professional or technical training		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Ask 9a only of those responding to 5, 6, 7 in Question 9.		
9a. Were you in a technical or vocational course?	22	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No 3. Mixed course		
10. Have you had any(other) occupational training? (Specify)	23	
11. When did you leave home?	24	
0. N.A. 1. in the last year 2. in the last two years 3. in the last three years 4. in the last four years 5. in the last five years 6. more than five years ago		
12. Why did you leave home?	25	
	26	
	27	
0. N.A. 1. strained relationships 2. wanted more freedom of action 3. wanted to live with someone else 4. family finances 5. moved for employment or education 6. pregnancy 7. drugs 8. don't know 9. other (specify)		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
13. How many jobs have you had in the last two years? (If respondent has been out of school less than two years, since he left school)	28	_____
0. N.A. 1. none 2. one 3. two 4. three 5. four 6. five or more		
14. What was your last full-time job?	29	_____
	30	_____
15. How much did you make in a week?	31	_____
0. N.A. 1. under \$40.00 2. \$40.00-\$49.99 3. \$50.00-\$59.99 4. \$60.00-\$74.99 5. \$75.00-\$89.99 6. \$90.00-\$109.99 7. \$110.00-\$129.99 8. \$130.00-\$149.99 9. \$150.00 or more		
16. What did you like about it?	32	_____
0. N.A. 1. nothing 2. friends at work 3. income 4. intrinsic pleasure of the job 5. having a regular routine 6. sense of productivity 7. family and/or friends pleased about it 8. working conditions good 9. other (specify)	33 34	_____

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
17. What did you dislike about it?		
0. N.A.	35	
1. nothing	36	
2. boss unpleasant		
3. other people at work	37	
4. low pay		
5. poor working conditions		
6. work difficult or unpleasant		
7. working hours inconvenient		
8. other (specify)		
18. Why did you leave it?		
0. N.A.	38	
1. laid off	39	
2. fired		
3. short-term job		
4. job eliminated		
5. wanted to look for another job		
6. wasn't worth doing for the pay		
7. wanted to leave the community		
8. other (specify)		
19. Are you earning any money now?		40
0. N.A.		
1. Yes		
2. No (Skip to Question 20)		
19a. How much do you earn a week?		41
0. N.A.		
1. 0-\$4.99		
2. \$5.00-\$9.99		
3. \$10.00-\$14.99		
4. \$15.00-\$19.99		
5. \$20.00-\$24.99		
6. \$25.00-\$29.99		
7. \$30.00-\$34.99		
8. \$35.00-\$39.99		
9. \$40.00 or more		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
20. How much do you get a week from Welfare?	42	
0. N.A. 1. under \$15.00 2. \$15.00-\$19.99 3. \$20.00-\$24.99 4. \$25.00-\$29.99 5. \$30.00-\$34.99 6. \$35.00-\$39.99 7. \$40.00 or more		
21. Altogether, how much do you have a week?	43	
0. 0-\$19.99 1. \$20.00-\$24.99 2. \$25.00-\$29.99 3. \$30.00-\$34.99 4. \$35.00-\$39.99 5. \$40.00-\$44.99 6. \$45.00-\$49.99 7. \$50.00 or more		
22. Do you feel this is enough to meet your needs?	44	
0. N.A. 1. Yes (Skip to Question 24) 2. No		
23. Is there anything essential or very important you can't do because of your income level?	45	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Question 24)		
23a. What can't you do?	46	
0. N.A. 1. get proper housing 2. get proper clothing 3. get an adequate diet 4. pay debts 5. entertainment 6. maintain membership in clubs, organizations, church 7. buy and/or operate a car 8. date 9. other (specify)	47 48 49	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
24. Do you share expenses with anyone else? (How many people share with you?)	50	
0. N.A. 1. No 2. Yes, one other 3. Yes, two others 4. Yes, three others 5. Yes, four or more others		
25. What is your parents' annual income?	51	
0. N.A. 1. 0-\$2,999 2. \$3,000-\$3,999 3. \$4,000-\$4,999 4. \$5,000-\$5,999 5. \$6,000-\$6,999 6. \$7,000-\$7,999 7. \$8,000-\$9,999 8. \$10,000-\$14,999 9. \$15,000 or more		
26. Is there any particular kind of work you are looking for now?	52 53	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Question 28)		
26a. What kind? Why?	54 55	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
27. How do you rate your chances of getting the kind of work you would prefer? (In, let's say, the next three or four months.)	56	
0. N.A. 1. excellent 2. very good 3. good 4. fair 5. poor 6. very poor		
28. Are there particular kinds of work you would not take?	57	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Question 30)		
28a. What are they? Why?	58 59 60	
29. Have you any medical problems that limit the work you can do? (Specify)	61 62	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
30. What is the minimum weekly income you would work for?	63	
0. N.A. 1. up to \$29.99 2. \$30.00-\$34.99 3. \$35.00-\$39.99 4. \$40.00-\$44.99 5. \$45.00-\$49.99 6. \$50.00-\$59.99 7. \$60.00-\$69.99 8. \$70.00-\$79.99 9. \$80.00 or over		
31. How often have you gone out looking for work in the last two weeks?	64	
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4 6. 5-9 7. 10-14 8. 15 or more		
32. Have you registered at Manpower?	65	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Question 33)		
32a. How many referrals have you had? (In the last 3 months if respondent has been without work longer.)	66	
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4-5 6. 6-9 7. 10 or more		

		<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
33. Have you registered with any other employment agencies?	67		
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Question 34)			
33a. How many referrals have you had?	68		
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4-5 6. 6-9 7. 10 or more			
34. Have your friends suggested places to you where work might be available? (that you hadn't been aware of?)	69		
0. N.A. 1. never 2. once or twice 3. 3-5 times 4. 4-10 times 5. over 10 times			
35. How many individual firms have you checked with? (in the last 3 months)	70 71		
0. N.A. 5. 10-14 1. 0 6. 15-19 2. 1-2 7. 20-29 3. 3-5 8. 30 or more 4. 6-9			
(Interviewer will list as many as the respondent can name off the top of his head, up to 10.)			

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
36. Would you like to get some further education or job training?	72	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. Undecided 3. No (Skip to Question 37)		
36a. What kind might you like to take?	73	
37. Do your parents know you are receiving public assistance?	74	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Question 38) 3. Don't know (Skip to Question 38)		
37a. How do they feel about it?	75	
0. N.A. 1. Don't know (Skip to Question 38) 2. Indifferent 3. Pleased (don't have to support me) 4. Accepting (the right thing to do) 5. Resigned (the only thing to do) 6. Disappointed 7. Angry 8. Shocked 9. Other (specify)		
37b. How do you feel about their attitude?	76	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
37c. Why?	77	
38. Have your parents ever received public assistance?	78	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No (Skip to Question 39)		
		<u>Card 2</u>
38a. How much of your last five years at home were they on welfare?	9	
0. N.A. 1. none 2. up to 3 months 3. up to 6 months 4. up to a year 5. up to 2 years 6. more than 2 years		
39. Are some of your friends receiving welfare now?	10	
0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. No		

		<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>			
40. How do your friends, in general, feel about your receiving welfare?	11					
0. N.A. 1. I don't know 2. They don't know about it 3. Indifferent 4. Pleased for me 5. Accepting 6. Resigned 7. Disappointed 8. Angry 9. Other (specify)						
41. How do you feel about their attitude?	12					
41a. Why?	13					
42. How often do you:						
	<u>N.A.</u>	<u>once a week</u>	<u>once a month</u>	<u>less often</u>	<u>never</u>	
a) have friends in	0	1	2	3	4	14
b) go out to visit friends	0	1	2	3	4	15
c) go to meetings of groups or organizations	0	1	2	3	4	16
d) go to church	0	1	2	3	4	17

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Do not ask Question 43 of those responding 3 or 4 in Question 42(c).		
43. What sorts of groups or organizations are you involved with?	18 19 20	
0. N.A. 1. church groups 2. social agency groups 3. unions 4. political, public affairs and pressure groups 5. social groups 6. sports groups 7. interest groups 8. other (specify)		
44. Do you drink alcohol?	21	
0. N.A. 1. frequently 2. sometimes 3. occasionally 4. rarely 5. never		
45. Do you smoke marijuana?	22	
0. N.A. 1. frequently 2. sometimes 3. occasionally 4. rarely 5. never		
46. Do you use stronger drugs? (e.g. LSD, speed, heroin)	23	
0. N.A. 1. frequently 2. sometimes 3. occasionally 4. rarely 5. never		

		<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
47.	How much time do you spend watching T.V.? (In an average week)	24	
	0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1-5 hours 3. 6-10 hours 4. 11-15 hours 5. 16-20 hours 6. 21-25 hours 7. 26-30 hours 8. 31-35 hours 9. 36+		
48.	How much time do you spend listening to the radio? (In an average week)	25	
	0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1-5 hours 3. 6-10 hours 4. 11-15 hours 5. 16-20 hours 6. 21-25 hours 7. 26-30 hours 8. 31-35 hours 9. 36+		
49.	Would you like to get married?	26	
	0. N.A. 1. Yes 2. Undecided 3. No		
49a.	What things do you see about marriage that are attractive?	27 28	
	0. N.A. 1. want a family 2. economically better 3. companionship 4. sex 5. emotional security 6. socially acceptable 7. want to look after/be responsible for someone 8. romantic involvement 9. other (specify)		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
49b. What things do you see about marriage that are unattractive?	29	
	30	
0. N.A. 1. not attracted to opposite sex 2. afraid it would go bad 3. would limit freedom 4. not so good economically 5. dislike intimacy, "lone wolf" 6. too much responsibility 7. having a good life as a single person 8. the "married role" not a desirable one 9. other (specify)		
Now we have a set of statements that are true for some people but not for others. I would like to see if you think they apply to you. Could you tell me if you think they are true, mostly true, equally true and false, mostly false, or false.		
50. I become enthusiastic about a lot of things.	31	
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
51. I find it hard to understand perfectionists.	32	
0. N.A. 1. false 2. mostly false 3. equally true and false 4. mostly true 5. true		
52. I often find it hard to think of something I feel like doing.	33	
0. N.A. 1. false 2. mostly false 3. equally true and false 4. mostly true 5. true		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
53. I try to live in a conventional way.	34	_____
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
54. I have an active imagination.	35	_____
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
55. I make plans and follow them.	36	_____
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
56. I like to work out new ways of doing things.	37	_____
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
57. I often act impulsively.	38	_____
0. N.A. 1. false 2. mostly false 3. equally true and false 4. mostly true 5. true		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
58. I like to hear about new ideas.	39	_____
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
59. I try to make sure the things I do are in good taste.	40	_____
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
60. I don't often feel like taking on new responsibilities.	41	_____
0. N.A. 1. false 2. mostly false 3. equally true and false 4. mostly true 5. true		
61. I am a cautious person.	42	_____
0. N.A. 1. true 2. mostly true 3. equally true and false 4. mostly false 5. false		
<u>For office use</u>		
43		_____
44		_____

Column Code

Now we have a set of questions on how you feel about life.
There are no right or wrong answers. We would just like to
know how you feel.

62. What is the most important thing in your life right now?

63. How do you expect things will be for you 5 years from
now?

64. Do you ever worry about your ability to do what people
expect of you or ask of you?

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
65. Does your life sometimes seem to be without purpose?		
66. How satisfied would you say you are with your way of life?		
67. As you look back on your life, what are the things that are most satisfying?		
68. Do you feel you have gotten more of the breaks in life than most of the people you know?		

Column Code

69. What could make your life happier than it is now?

Now we have three statements of opinion. Could you tell how you feel about these points of view.

70. A person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

71. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
72. The lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.		
73. Finding a job is more a matter of luck or connections than it is of how hard you look for one.		
74. Once you have a job, getting ahead depends more on the breaks you get than on how well you do your work.		
	45	
	46	
	47	
	48	
	49	
	50	
	51	
	52	
	53	
	54	

APPENDIX C - SECOND ROUND LONGER QUESTIONNAIRE

February 15, 1972.

SINGLE YOUNG PEOPLE ON WELFARE

QUESTIONNAIRE TWO

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Case Number	1	
	2	
	3	
Card	4	1
Sex: 1. M	5	
2. F		
Sample: 1. new cases	6	
2. old cases		
Interview	7	2
Interviewer	8	
1. What kind of housing is the respondent occupying?	9	
0. N.A.		
1. own house (Skip to Question 3)		
2. pays room only in rooming house		
3. pays room and board in rooming house		
4. high rise apartment dwelling (5 floors or more)		
5. low rise apartment dwelling		
6. parents' (guardians') home.		
2. What is the location of room or apartment?	10	
0. N.A.		
1. basement		
2. 1st floor		
3. 2nd floor or above		
3. How do you like living here?	11	
0. N.A.		
1. dislike strongly		
2. dislike		
3. neutral (Skip to Question 4)		
4. like (Skip to Question 4)		
5. like strongly (Skip to Question 4)		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
3a. Any particular reasons for disliking?	(Col. 52)	
4. How many different places (residences) have you lived in (in Hamilton and district) in the last two years?	12	
0. N.A. 1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5-9 6. 10-19 7. 20 and over		
5. Do you have any plans to leave Hamilton? (When?)	13	
0. N.A. 1. No 2. Uncertain 3. Yes, inside of a month 4. Yes, inside of six months 5. Yes, after more than 6 months 6. Yes, at an indefinite time		
6. What do you plan to do over the next six months? (Probe: do you expect to get a job?)	14 (Col. 55)	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
7. Do you expect that Canada Manpower Centre will help you to get a job?	15	
0. N.A. 1. yes 2. no 3. don't know 4. uncertain		
8. Has it been helpful to you, in any way, in the past? (What way(s)?)	16 17	
0. N.A. 1. job referrals 2. to get welfare 3. courses 4. counselling 5. relocation grants 6. suggestions of places to look		
9. Do you have any suggestions for making Manpower more useful?	18 19	
0. N.A. 1. no		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
10. How old are you?	20	
0. N.A.		
1. 16		
2. 17		
3. 18		
4. 19		
5. 20		
6. 21		
7. 22		
8. 23		
9. 24-25		
11. How far did you go with your schooling?	21	
0. N.A.		
1. no formal education		
2. 0-4 years		
3. 5 years or more, but elementary incomplete		
4. elementary complete		
5. some secondary, but not up to Grade 10		
6. Grade 10, but secondary incomplete		
7. secondary complete		
8. university training		
9. post secondary professional or technical training		
12. Why did you stop your schooling where you did?	22	
	23	
12a. When you left school, did your parents try to encourage you to go farther? (How strongly?)		
0. N.A.		
1. no		
2. encouraged slightly		
3. encouraged rather strongly		
4. encouraged strongly		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
13. When did you leave home?	24	
0. N.A.		
1. in the last year (over 2 mons.)	(Skip to Question 15)	
2. in the last 2 years	(Skip to Question 15)	
3. in the last 3 years	(Skip to Question 15)	
4. in the last 4 years	(Skip to Question 15)	
5. in the last 5 years	(Skip to Question 15)	
6. more than five years ago	(Skip to Question 15)	
7. in the last two weeks		
8. in the last month		
9. in the last 2 months		
14. Why did you leave home?	25	
26		
0. N.A.		
1. strained relationships		
2. wanted more freedom of action		
3. wanted to live with someone else		
4. family finances		
5. moved for employment or education		
6. pregnancy		
7. drugs		
8. don't know		
9. other (specify)		
15. If you could change the way your life has been so far, what things would you change?	27	
	28	
	29	
	30	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
16. Suppose you had a child of 10 or 12. What advice would you give (him/her) on how to live?	31 32 33 34	_____
17. What do you think of using drugs?	35 36 37	_____
18. In your last job, how much did you make a week?	38	_____
	0. N.A. 1. under \$40 2. \$40-\$49.99 3. \$50-\$59.99 4. \$60-\$74.99 5. \$75-\$89.99 6. \$90-\$109.99 7. \$110-\$129.99 8. \$130-\$149.99 9. \$150 or over	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
19. Are you off welfare now?	39	
0. N.A. 1. No 2. Yes, before 2nd interview 3. will be in next two weeks		
20. Are you earning any money now?	40	
0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes, part-time 3. yes, full-time		
21. How much do you earn a week?	41	
0. N.A. 1. under \$40 2. \$40-\$49.99 3. \$50-\$59.99 4. \$60-\$74.99 5. \$75-\$89.99 6. \$90-\$109.99 7. \$110-\$129.99 8. \$130-\$149.99 9. \$150 or over		
22. (Don't ask of those who aren't on welfare.) How much do you get a week from welfare?	42	
0. N.A. 1. under \$15 2. \$15-\$19.99 3. \$20-\$24.99 4. \$25-\$29.99 5. \$30-\$34.99 6. \$35-\$39.99 7. \$40 or more		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
23. (Don't ask of those who aren't on welfare.) Altogether how much do you have a week?	43	
0. N.A.		
1. 0-\$19.99		
2. \$20-\$24.99		
3. \$25-\$29.99		
4. \$30-\$34.99		
5. \$35-\$39.99		
6. \$40-\$44.99		
7. \$45-\$49.99		
8. 50 or more		
24. If any, what is your present job (BE SPECIFIC)?	44	
	45	
	46	
25. How much would you say people whom you know, your own age and not on welfare, are making on the average? (per week)	47	
0. N.A. - don't know		
1. under \$40		
2. \$40-\$49.99		
3. \$50-\$59.99		
4. \$60-\$74.99		
5. \$75-\$89.99		
6. \$90-\$109.99		
7. \$110-\$129.99		
8. \$130-\$149.99		
9. \$150 or over		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
26. Are there any things that they have or that they can do that you can't? (What?)	48 49	_____
27. Do you share expenses with anyone else?	50	_____
0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes, one other 3. yes, two others 4. yes, three others 5. yes, four or more others		
28. (If respondent has no job) How do you rate your chances of getting any job?	51	_____
0. N.A. 1. excellent 2. very good 3. good 4. fair 5. poor 6. very poor 7. don't want one		
Office use for Question 3a	52	_____

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
29. What kind of job would you prefer?	53	
0. N.A. (none)	54	
1-7 specific answers (write in below)		
8. anything		
9. uncodeable		
<u>Office use for Question 6</u>		55
30. How do you rate your chances of getting the kind of work you prefer?	56	
0. N.A.		
1. excellent		
2. very good		
3. good		
4. fair		
5. poor		
6. very poor		
7. don't want work		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Suppose you were offered the jobs I'll now describe. Would you take any of them?		
31. <u>Female</u>	57	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You are offered the position of waitress, serving food in a small restaurant for minimum wage (\$1.65/hr.) plus tips. 		
<u>Male</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You are offered the position of cook's assistant in a small restaurant for \$1.85 per hour. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes 3. yes, for short time 4. yes, until something else comes up 		
32. <u>Female</u>	58	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You are offered the position of a housekeeper in a pleasant home, with one young child to mind as well as cleaning duties. The pay would be \$2.00 an hour. 		
<u>Male</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You are offered the position of janitor for an office building. The pay would be \$2.00 an hour. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes 3. yes, for short time 4. yes, until something else comes up 		
33. You are offered a position doing door to door sales. Your starting salary would be \$1.75 an hour and this would increase with the amount of sales you brought in.	59	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes 3. yes, for short time 4. yes, until something else comes up 		

		<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
34.	You are offered a position as a salesclerk in a retail store. Your salary would be \$1.65 an hour plus 1% commission on all sales.	60	
	0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes 3. yes, for short time 4. yes, until something else comes up		
35.	You are offered a job working on the line in a factory with 8 hour shift work. Your salary would be \$3.00 an hour.	61	
	0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes 3. yes, for short time 4. yes, until something else comes up		
36.	<u>Female</u>	62	
	- You are offered the position of cashier in a chain grocery store. Your salary would be \$1.65 an hour.		
	<u>Male</u>		
	- You are offered the position of parcel and pick-up boy at a chain grocery store. Your salary would be \$1.65 an hour.		
	0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes 3. yes, for short time 4. yes, until something else comes up		
37.	What is the minimum weekly income you would work for?	63	
	0. N.A. 1. under \$40 2. \$40-\$49.99 3. \$50-\$59.99 4. \$60-\$74.99 5. \$75-\$89.99 6. \$90-\$109.99 7. \$110-\$129.99 8. \$130-\$149.99 9. \$150 and over.		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
38. How often have you gone out looking for work in the last 2 weeks?	64	
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4 6. 5-9 7. 10-14 8. 15 or more		
39. Have you registered at Manpower?	65	
0. N.A. 1. yes 2. no (Skip to Question 41)		
40. How many referrals have you had since the last interview?	66	
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4-5 6. 6-9 7. 10 or more		
41. Have you registered with any other employment agencies?	67	
0. N.A. 1. yes 2. no (Skip to Question 44)		
42. How many referrals have you had? (since the last interview)	68	
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4-5 6. 6-9 7. 10 or more		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
43. What are the names of these employment agencies?	69	_____
44. How many individual firms have you checked with? (since the last interview)	70	_____
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1 3. 2 4. 3 5. 4-6 6. 7-10 7. 10 or more		
45. Would you like to get some further education? What kind?	71 72	_____ _____
0. N.A. 1. no		
46. Would you like to get some further job training? What kind?	73 74	_____ _____
0. N.A. 1. no		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
47. How do your parents feel about your being on welfare?	75	
0. N.A. 1. they don't know 2. indifferent 3. pleased (don't have to support me) 4. accepting (the right thing to do) 5. resigned (the only thing to do) 6. disappointed 7. angry 8. I don't know 9. other (specify)		
48. How do you feel about being on welfare?	76	
0. N.A. 1. I don't know 2. indifferent 3. it's okay (accepting) 4. only thing I could do (resigned) 5. it's great (pleased) 6. disappointed 7. angry 8. other (specify)		
49. Would you like to see changes made in the Welfare System? What kind?	77 78	

CARD 2

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Case number	1	_____
	2	_____
	3	_____
Card number	4	2
Marital Status: 0. single 1. separated 2. divorced	5	_____
Area Code	6	_____
Interview Number	7	2
	8	_____
	9	_____
50. Are some of your friends receiving welfare now? How many?		
0. N.A. (no friends) (Skip to Question 57) 1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5-7 6. 8-10 7. 11-15 8. 16 or more 9. no (Skip to Question 54)		
51. Are they people you knew before going on welfare?	10	_____
0. N.A. 1. all of them 2. some of them 3. none of them		
52. How do your friends feel about receiving it?	11	_____
0. N.A. 1. I don't know 2. indifferent 3. accepting - its okay 4. resigned (only thing to do) 5. it's great (pleased) 6. disappointed 7. angry 8. other (specify)		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
53. How often do you see your friends who <u>are</u> on welfare?	12	_____
0. N.A. 1. 5 times or more a week 2. 3-4 times a week 3. 1-2 times a week 4. 2-3 times a month 5. once a month 6. less often 7. never		
54. How often do you see your friends who <u>aren't</u> on welfare?	13	_____
0. N.A. 1. 5 times or more a week 2. 2-4 times a week 3. 1-2 times a week 4. 2-3 times a month 5. once a month 6. less often 7. never		
55. How often do you have friends in?	14	_____
0. N.A. 1. more than once a week 2. just once a week 3. 2-3 times a month 4. once a month 5. less often 6. never		
56. How often do you visit friends at their homes?	15	_____
0. N.A. 1. more than once a week 2. just once a week 3. 2-3 times a month 4. once a month 5. less often 6. never		

		<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
57.	How often do you go <u>out places</u> with friends?	16	_____
	0. N.A. 1. more than once a week 2. just once a week 3. 2-3 times a month 4. once a month 5. less often 6. never		
58.	(If not living at home or both parents deceased) How often do you see your parents?	17	_____
	0. N.A. 1. more than once a week 2. just once a week 3. 2-3 times a month 4. once a month 5. less often 6. never		
59.	(Ask where applicable) How often do you see your brother(s) and/or sister(s)?	18	_____
	0. N.A. 1. more than once a week 2. just once a week 3. 2-3 times a month 4. once a month 5. less often 6. never		
60.	How often do you see a movie?	19	_____
	0. N.A. 1. more than once a week 2. just once a week 3. 2-3 times a month 4. once a month (Skip to Question 62) 5. less often (Skip to Question 62) 6. never (Skip to Question 62)		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
61. What time of day do you most often go to the movies?	20	
0. N.A. 1. afternoons 2. early evening (after 5) 3. late evening (9 o'clock) 4. no specific time		
62. How much time do you spend listening to records? (in an average week)	21	
0. N.A. 1. 0 2. 1-5 hours 3. 6-10 hours 4. 11-15 hours 5. 16-20 hours 6. 21-25 hours 7. 26-30 hours 8. 31-35 hours 9. 36+		
63. Are there times of day that you particularly like to watch television?	22	
0. N.A. 1. morning programs 2. afternoon programs 3. evening programs 4. late evening (after 11 p.m.)		
64. Are there times of day that you particularly like to listen to records?	23	
0. N.A. 1. morning programs 2. afternoon programs 3. evening programs 4. late evening (after 11 p.m.)		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
65. If it weren't for the difference in income, how much better or worse would you say it is(was) to be on welfare than working? Why?	24 25 26	_____
66. Do you have a preference for any one political party? <u>(Federal)</u>	27	_____
0. N.A. 1. no preference (Skip to Question 68) 2. Progressive Conservative 3. Liberal 4. NDP 5. Communism 6. Social Credit 7. other (specify)		
67. Why is this your preference? (The main reason)	28	_____
68. What do you think of common-law marriages?	29 30	_____

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
---------------	-------------

The following are 14 different 'ways of living'. We would like to know the kind of style you personally would like to live. We are not looking for any particular right or wrong answers. For each way of living tell us whether you like it very much, like it slightly, are indifferent to it, dislike it slightly, dislike it very much.

69. I enjoy working out new ways of doing things. I like to hear about new ideas. I often do things impulsively, without thinking very much beforehand.	31
O. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much	
70. I enjoy belonging to a social group and going along with them. A group of people are very important to me. I share my enthusiasm with others.	32
O. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much	
71. I enjoy the simple pleasures of life such as comfortable surroundings, good food, relaxation and just being alive. I almost always try to be at ease, calm, carefree with no driving ambitions.	33
O. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
72. I never make demands for anything. I feel that the good things of life will come if I just wait for them.	34	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
73. I like to be alone, live in a private place and have lots of time to myself. I try to understand myself and I avoid depending on other people.	35	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
74. I am constantly active and adventurous. I never sit around. I try to find practical solutions to problems. My future depends mostly on what I do, not what I think or feel.	36	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
75. I like to use my hands to make things. I enjoy physical activity such as sports. I get satisfaction from solving a challenging problem.	37	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
76. I enjoy working to improve the community. I realize that changes take time and must be carefully planned. I am an active person, but I always keep control of myself.	38	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
77. I believe people can be trusted. I like to listen to people's problems and help in making decisions. I am quiet, faithful and I never insist on my own way.	39	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
78. I live in my own world of ideals. I am very sensitive. The outside world is too big and full of pressures. I realize that aggressive action is of little use.	40	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
79. I enjoy life as much as I possibly can - let myself go. I don't spend too much time on any one thing because there are so many experiences to enjoy. I avoid <u>strong</u> attachments to other people. I enjoy a lively social time, but need some time to myself.	41	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
80. I like to be open to others, helping when I can. I am affectionate and sympathetic toward others.	42	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
81. I am in complete self-control. I always have a reason for what I do. I am reliable and independent. I never rely too much on others.	43	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
82. I enjoy life but also spend time thinking. I never go to any extremes. I'm never completely open about my feelings, but I am willing to let others open up with me.	44	
0. N.A. 1. like very much 2. like slightly 3. am indifferent to it 4. dislike slightly 5. dislike very much		
Now we have a set of questions on how you feel about life. There are no right or wrong answers. We would just like to know how you feel.		
83. What is the most important thing in your life right now?		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
84. How do you expect things will be for you 5 years from now?		
85. Do you ever worry about your ability to do what people expect of you or ask of you?		
86. Does your life sometimes seem to be without purpose?		
87. How satisfied would you say you are with your way of life?		

Column | Code

88. As you look back on your life, what are the things that are most satisfying?

89. Do you feel you have gotten more of the breaks in life than most of the people you know?

90. What could make your life happier than it is now?

<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
---------------	-------------

Now we have four statements of opinion. Could you tell how you feel about these points of view.

91. A person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

92. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.

93. The lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.
1) materially; 2) human characteristics; 3) scientifically.

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
94. Finding a job is more a matter of luck or connections than it is of how hard you look for one.	75	
0. N.A. 1. true - luck and/or connections 2. false - how hard you look 3. both		
95. Some people feel they have had a difficult life and react to this by trying very hard to improve their situation. Would you say this is true of you?		
0. N.A. 1. no 2. yes 3. uncertain 4. don't know		
96. Please rank these in order of importance to you.		
Friends Income Leisure Time Education Work		

COLUMNCODEFREQUENCY

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Question 90	75	
Mood Tone Positive (51+55)	76	
Mood Tone Negative (52+56+57)	77	
Relationships (47-48)	78	

CARD 3

Case Number	1	
	2	
	3	
Card Number	4	3
Future	5	
	6	
Interview Number	7	2
Content vs. Dissatisfied (51-52) (69-70)	8	
Welfare status	9	
Drive scale	10	
Swinger scale	11	
Quadrants	12	

APPENDIX D - SECOND ROUND SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE

BRIEF SCHEDULE FOR THOSE WORKING AT TIME OF FIRST INTERVIEW

March 23, 1972.

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
Case No.	1	
	2	
	3	
Card	4	
Sex: 1. M	5	
2. F		
Sample	6	
Interview	7	
Interviewer	8	
1. What are you doing now?	9	
	10	
2. How long had you been on welfare when you got your job?	11	
0. N.A.		
1. less than a week		
2. less than 2 weeks		
3. less than a month		
4. less than 2 months		
5. less than 3 months		
6. less than 4 months		
7. less than 5 months		
8. less than 6 months		
9. 6 months or more		
3. How did you get your job?	12	
0. N.A.		
1. Manpower		
2. other employment agency		
3. answering an ad		
4. heard about an opening		
5. had name on file		
6. checked in at right time		
7. connections		
8. other (specify)		

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
4. How do you enjoy it?	13	
0. N.A. 1. very much 2. quite a bit 3. not very much 4. very little		
5. How much are you making?	14	
0. N.A. 1. under \$40 2. \$40-\$49.99 3. \$50-\$59.99 4. \$60-\$74.99 5. \$75-\$89.99 6. \$90-\$109.99 7. \$110-\$129.99 8. \$130-\$149.99 9. \$150 and over		
6. If it weren't for the difference in income, how much better or worse would you say it was to be on welfare than working? Why?	15 16 17	
7. Would you like to see changes made in the Welfare System? What kind?	18 19	

	<u>Column</u>	<u>Code</u>
8. Some people feel they have had a difficult life and react to this by trying very hard to improve their situation. Would you say this is true of you?	20	
0. N.A.		
1. no		
2. yes		
3. uncertain		
4. don't know		
9. Please rank these in order of importance to you.	21	
Friends	22	
Income	23	
Leisure Time	24	
Education	25	
Work		
10. How satisfied would you say you are with your way of life?	26	

HAMILTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 2022 21292759 0